

Safeguard the Pavement Repair Programs for both roads and pathways.

Revise the proposed TIP Amendment:

- a. Retain the adopted funding levels for Pavement Replacement RDY00012 and NMO0008: no reductions. The Comment Response implies there isn't contractor or managerial capacity to do the original slate of repairs. AMATS can expand capacity for repairs by dropping or postponing new construction projects, such as the unneeded 92nd Avenue interchange and freeway expansion. Fix what we have before expanding.
- b. Direct AMATS to list the timeline, price, and ranking of the proposed repair projects, so the public can see the effect of any future budget reductions.
- c. Ask AMATS to adopt a higher target for the percent of roads in good repair. The DOTPF target for good repair (15% of non-highways and 20% of highways) is inadequate for Anchorage's safety and health and economic development.

Under the proposed Amendment, the Roadway Pavement Repair Program would be slashed 38% in 2023 (from \$16M to \$10M), with additional reductions in 2024 and 2025.

The Trails and Pathways Pavement Repair Program would cut be over 65% in 2023 (from 1.7M to 600K). There are further reductions of 50% in 2024 and over 40% in 2025.

2. Spend Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) funds effectively. Recommendations the TAC should make regarding CRP funds:

Revise the proposed TIP Amendment:

- a. Form a joint advisory committee with the TAC, CAC and Bike/Ped Committee to nominate and vet projects for using the unallocated CRP funds on specific Non-Motorized projects that are currently underfunded or are funded with STBG funds. An advisory committee with multiple types of expertise will ensure effective carbon reductions.
- b. Take all of the CRP funds out of project OFS0004 Campbell driveway re-alignment. A bikeable road shoulder should be a de facto part of any road. The shoulder of this driveway should be funded with STBG funds, not Carbon Reduction Program Funds. It will not create a travel mode shift. This gives the public little confidence that the CRP projects nominated by AMATS staff will be effective ways to reduce the carbon footprint of our transportation.
- c. Fund a Transit Plan and Transit improvements with CRP funds. Anchorage lacks convenient, comfortable transit service that provides a viable alternative to driving. Headway times are simply not short enough, and connections are inconvenient.

3. Retain the scope of work for the mapping of non-motorized easements and ROW (PLN00019).

Revise the proposed TIP Amendment, which is mis-leading:

- a. Retain the adopted scope of work for PLN00019, so that this project includes a map inventory of non-motorized easements and ROW, as directed by the Policy Committee 4 months ago.

b. Ask for a correction to the AMATS memo on the TIP Amendment that “This work is done”. Mapping is not "done", despite that proclamation by AMATS staff. ROW and easements are not compiled and mapped in a form that is easily accessible to planners or the public. My Community Council sent AMATS a half-dozen examples of phantom easements that are unrepresented on commonly-used Muni maps. AMATS did not respond.

Maps are critical for public awareness and for staff decisions on non-motorized connectivity, especially because *there is no municipal transportation planner and the position of Municipal Non-Motorized Coordinator is unfilled*. Also, property owners want to know where easements and ROW are.

The staff’s claim that mapping undeveloped ROW would “require field surveys that would take ten years and millions of dollars” is highly specious. Undeveloped ROW were already surveyed, platted and recorded: they are just not mapped in a way that’s useful for planning, or for protecting them.

4. Cancel or delay the 92nd Ave Freeway interchange NHS0004 and collector road RDY00013

Delete or suspend Seward Highway O'Malley to Dimond NHS0004 and Academy and Vanguard RDY00013.

The 92nd Avenue Freeway interchange and related highway expansion is unsafe, unneeded, and hugely expensive. Cancellation would allow DOT to reallocate \$105 million in 2023. This money would become available for higher-priority transportation projects in the AMATS area.

The costs for this project keep changing without visible explanation. Costs beyond 2026 have been removed from the TIP. The Policy Committee might want to inquire.

Regarding resistance from the Alaska Department of Transportation:

1. *It's too late in the process, with RFPs and contracts set for late spring.* It's not too late. The time is now. Before contracting.

2. *The project can't be phased or downsized: it would need to be re-designed, and that takes 4 to 6 years.* A re-design of several years would not pose traffic problems. Safety can be addressed immediately with pop-up solutions such as a protected non-motorized lane on Brayton Drive, possibly using unallocated Carbon Reduction Program funds. Transit on Dimond Blvd can be improved. There's no vehicle capacity problem: DOT's own statistics show flat or declining traffic volumes on East Dimond, West Abbott, and the Seward Highway. A re-design can truly focus on safety by prioritizing non-motorized users and not generating high-speed through-traffic in a low income neighborhoods. The Diverging Diamond intersection also needs reconsideration, as it is a high-stress, inconvenient design for non-motorized users.

3. *The 92nd Interchange supports the Land Use Plan 2040.* Well, hardly. The 92nd Interchange works against a walkable neighborhood community center at West Abbott, by diverting residents to the Dimond regional shopping area. Although 92nd Avenue is shown as a future transit corridor in the LUP, it ranks last in priority of a list of potential future transit corridors.

4. *Contractors may be hungry for this work.* The DOT Central Region has a record amount of money for contracting in 2023, so it will be a busy year for contractors even without the 92nd Ave project. Bill Popp stated at a recent meeting that projects in 2023 will go to out-of-state contractors because there is too much construction for Alaska contractors.

5. *DOT could reallocate the money to projects outside of Anchorage.* The sovereignty of DOT to move funding out of the AMATS area is unclear: the authority for that should be clarified. Anchorage has many worthy and needed transportation projects, identified by the Assembly and the community councils. MPOs are supposed to engage in continuous and collaborative transportation planning, per federal guidelines. This project is not an economic benefit to Anchorage if it is unsafe, devalues property, and induces more traffic and maintenance costs.

6. *The Federal Highway Administration might require the state to reimburse the feds for money spent on the project thus far.* DOT can negotiate with the FHWA on this issue. FHWA has partnered with state DOTs across the country to modify projects to meet their evolving needs. Money spent thus far may be less than the 10% State match DOT would pay going forward on a \$200M bundle of road projects.

TO: AMATS Policy Committee

Re: your acceptance of the Comment Response document on the TIP Amendment #1

AMATS Policy Committee members, please consider the following changes as a condition of accepting/approving the Comment Response document on the TIP Amendment #1.

1. Non-motorized inventory mapping.

Comments 56, 71, 81, 90

1A. Direct AMATS to include Non-motorized mapping in its Non-motorized Inventory. This mapping is not “done” as stated in earlier memos to the PC. “The MOA is working on it” is not an acceptable answer. There is no timeline or end-product for non-motorized mapping unless AMATS incorporates MOA efforts into its pending Non-Motorized Inventory.

1B. Get a straight, documented answer on depicting existing ROW on the maps. The staff answer defies logic: that existing, platted ROWs must be surveyed before being shown on planning maps. Existing ROW have already been surveyed as a condition of platting.

2 NHS0004 O’Malley Road to Dimond Blvd Reconstruction of the Seward Highway

Numerous comments: 17, 38, 58, 60, 73, 83, 88, 102

Some of these commenters specifically noted on obsolescent data for this project. Staff responded dismissively: " Thank you for your comment."

There is now documentation of the obsolescence and negative impacts of this project in the Assembly Resolution by Assembly Members Volland, Zaletel, and LaFrance, introduced on February 21.

2A. The Comment Response should acknowledge the data deficiencies and negative impacts for the O’Malley to Dimond Seward Highway project and direct DOT to respond to the Assembly resolutions on this issue.

3. Acknowledge the changes in CRP funding.

Several commenters wanted to eliminate CRP funding for the Campbell Creek Science Center road shoulder work, since a road shoulder should be part of any road project. (Comments 39, 45, etc). AMATS staff did reduce the CRP funding in this project from \$1.1 million to a less than \$300K. However, the Comment response final column says “No Change”.

3A. Instead of “No Change”, acknowledge the change.

4. A transparent public process.

Comments 26, 28, and 43 ask for transparency regarding how the TIP Amendment is created. Many millions of dollars have been shifted around, and projects have been added and revised. Staff’s answer is to list the agencies that participated. This tells almost nothing. Also, this TIP Amendment has had dozens of changes since the 11-28-2022 Public Review Draft, for which there was no public outreach.

4A. Please direct AMATS staff to explain the Amendment development process and post it on their AMATS website who(specifically what staff), when, and how the changes to the TIP are nominated and evaluated and voted on. Specifically, what scoring criteria are used?

4B. Provide easy public access, and a comment process, for iterations of the TIP Amendment.

4C. Direct AMATS to post an explanation of the changes in costs, funding levels, and scheduling in the TIP Amendment.

Thank you for ensuring that the Comment Response is not a pro forma exercise. The public has invested time and forethought, and deserves straight answers.

Nancy Pease

I wanted to reiterate my concerns for the speed limits that will be set for the design. If the whole idea is to make Spenard Road a multi transportation road, we need to protect the most vulnerable, pedestrians and bicyclists, by making the road slower than what is usually dictated and widening bike lanes.

As my wise husband brought up a couple of weeks ago at the SCC Task Force meeting, we aren't even taking into account Ebikes which are going to only grow in number as more people adopt them as a viable transportation source. They will be slower than vehicles but faster than bikes.

In good planning, It must be kept in mind as the project moves forward.

Thank you.
Margaret Auth