

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

**Planning & Development Center
Conference Room 170
4700 Elmore Road
Anchorage, Alaska**

**July 27, 2021
2:30 PM**

This meeting was conducted in-person and virtually

Community Advisory Committee Members Present:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Matt Cruickshank	District 2
Steve Horn	District 3
Jonathan Lang	District 5
Diana Evans	District 4
Mike Fenster	District 6
Bob French	Federation of Community Councils
Jon Scudder	JBER
Jim Winchester	Planning & Zoning Commission

Also in attendance:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Craig Lyon	AMATS Coordinator
James Starzec	DOT&PF
Christine Schuette	AMATS Planner
Aaron Jongenelen	MOA Planner
Shaina Kilcoyne	MOA/Energy and Sustainability
Nancy Pease	Member of the Public

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

VICE CHAIR SCUDDER called the meeting to order at 2:30 since Chair Cruickshank was on the phone and still en route phone to the meeting. A quorum was reached.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. FENSTER moved to approve the agenda. MS. Evans seconded.

Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

MR. HORN mentioned that he was not at the April 27 meeting.

MR. CRUICKSHANK moved to approve the minutes as amended. MR. HORN seconded.

Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

a. 2023-2026 TIP Criteria Update

MR. LYON briefed the committee noting that the TIP Criteria was out for a 60-day public review period. He stated that AMATS would like this committee to review the criteria and provide comments.

MR. FENSTER asked if the community councils have had a chance to review the criteria.

MR. LYON stated that the Policy Committee asked that the Criteria be released for a 60-day public review period so that the community councils would have a chance to look at it and provide comments when they resume meetings in September.

MR. SCUDDER stated that he believed that if a MOA traffic engineer recommended that that should be worth more than one point.

MR. LYON explained that staff was trying to objectify the scoring system as much as possible.

MR. FENSTER asked for clarification on the maximum points possible. Looking at Criteria 1 – Safety – it looked like the maximum points possible were 5 not 4.

MR. JONGENELEN explained that it was an either/or scenario. Projects with data will always score higher and will be assigned points from the top section. If there is an intersection or area that is a safety concern to MOA & DOT Traffic Engineers, but without any data to back up those concerns, the project can still get a point validating those concerns.

CHAIR CRUICKSHANK stated that he thought there was a reactive and a proactive approach to project scoring. With the reactive, we have the data to know what the areas of concern are, but with the proactive approach, we have an opportunity to address areas that could be problematic and if we have experts expressing those concerns, that should be even a little extra merit. He further asked if the criteria considered the community comprehensive plans.

MR JONGENELEN stated that we are a body made up of state and local representation and we can not only look at the comprehensive plans.

MR. LYON noted that this is the first time any consideration to industry expertise without data to back it up is being considered in the scoring system.

NANCY PEASE: asked if AMATS did any trial runs and scored some of the projects to see if they truly result in projects that fit a more compact land use pattern and reduce VMT and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, per the ACAP?

MR. LYON said that the Criteria were just released by the Policy Committee on Friday so AMATS has not had a chance to do that yet.

The committee further discussed safety issues within the Municipality and how data is captured.

NANCY PEASE asked if the committee would look at comments from Councils and the general public before their work session?

MS. EVANS asked if the committee could get a presentation of the public comments at their next scheduled meeting after the public comment period closes.

MR FRENCH asked what is the timeframe for the Scoring Criteria to be approved?

MR LYON said that the comment period ends September 20th.

The committee discussed how to move forward with giving their feedback on the TIP Criteria and it was decided that they would have a work session on August 12th at 10:00 am.

6. PROJECT AND PLAN UPDATES

a. Glenn Highway PEL Update

MR. LYON stated that the MOA received some funding awhile back and is using it to do a recon study, it is not AMATS funds. A draft has gone around for a scope of work, but it is still internal at this time.

MR CRUICKSHANK asked if we could invite Kent Kohlhase to present on this project at the next meeting.

MR LYON stated that he would investigate who at the Municipality of Anchorage could give an update and invite them to the next meeting.

b. Non-motorized Plan

MR LYON briefed the committee on the adoption of this plan by the Policy Committee on July 22, 2021. Staff will be working of the revisions to this plan per the public comments received and approved by the Policy Committee.

MS EVANS asked if the comments were posted online

MS SCHUETTE stated that the comments were online, but that she would email them out to the committee.

MR. LYON further explained that the comments were linked to the agenda page or the Policy committee meeting.

c. MTP 101

MR JONGENELEN gave an overview of the MTP development process.

The following were Committee and Public questions with responses noted in *Italic*.

Goals, Objectives, Performance Measures & Targets

(JS) Are electric vehicles incorporated in this at all?

(AJ) Not in the National Goals and Planning Factors, but in the 2040 MTP we did incorporate an objective to look at implementing policies to support electric vehicles. We will also look at that for the 2050 MTP.

(NP): Glad to see that MTP proclaims that is «continuous and cooperative». Therefore, will you include in your MTP 101 a list of the public comments that AMATS explicitly deferred from the MTP 2020? For example, AMATS promised to include a system for GHG reductions into the 2050 plan since AMATS didn't do that in the 2040 MTP. There were probably at least a dozen substantive issues that AMATS staff similarly deferred to 2050. So, can you list these deferred issues in your MTP intro so that the public knows they are being listened to?

(AJ) explained that this presentation is not specific to any 'one' planning period and is meant to explain the development process generally.

(MC) Can we stress what parts of the development process the public can have an impact on?

(AJ) Yes, we are not limited to the National Goals and Planning Factors, but they are the minimum requirements that AMATS must incorporate.

Criteria

(SH) Can you include an example of the MTP Criteria?

(AJ) Yes, we can include that.

(BF) Is there a difference between the TIP criteria and the MTP criteria?

(AJ) Yes, they are similar, but the MTP is a higher value, visionary document spanning a 20-year span and the TIP criteria are more specific, covering what do we want to do in the next 4 years.

(DE) Are the MTP criteria concrete and less subjective?

(AJ) In the past they have been subjective, I would like them to be more objective for the 2050 MTP. They must be more board because it is a planning document that spans a 20-year time period and we do not have all the design decisions in place.

Projects

(MF) How do you account for events like the 2018 Earthquake?

(AJ) We consider resiliency. For instance, a project that provides secondary access like a frontage road could help us be more resilient to unforeseen events in the future.

(MC) Is there a time period that projects can be added or adjusted?

(AJ) Yes, there is a specific time when projects are nominated, scored and ranked. If a project comes up after that time period that the Policy Committee feels is important, it can be scored and ranked along with the others and added to the plan.

(MC) How can community councils get a project in the MTP?

(AJ) Nominate it. Anyone can nominate a project. We also look at the community councils list of projects. And we look at plans that have been developed since the last MTP.

Funding

(MC) What about illustrative projects?)

(AJ) Anything that we do not have funding for now that we might have funding for later goes under the illustrative category. If we anticipate funding for the project within the 20 years of the MTP, then it is a fiscally constrained project. If we do not anticipate funding within the 20-year time period, but we still think that the project is important, then it goes under illustrative.

Policies

(AJ) These are policies just for AMATS.

(JS) There was a commuter rail committee that was disbanded about 3 years ago. I will just make a comment that having an alternate way to get to JBER is a national security issue.

Air Quality

(AJ) We are a maintenance area with a limited maintenance plan.

(MC) What would be an example of a project that would have a negative impact on air quality?

(AJ) One example would be a massive road expansion project that could lead to more cars on the road and more roadways for dust (PM10) to settle on.

(BF) How does maintenance come into play with that? Springtime maintenance certainly is important in determining how much dust we have in the air.

(AJ) Part of our Status of the System Analysis accounts for whether we can maintain and operate the system.

7. General Information - NONE

8. Committee Comments – NONE

10. ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.