

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Mayor's Conference Room, 8th Floor
632 W. 6th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska**

**January 18, 2024
1:00 PM**

*This meeting is available for viewing at
[Transportation Planning / AMATS Meetings \(muni.org\)](https://www.muni.org/transportation-planning/amats-meetings)*

Policy Committee Members Present:

Name	Representing
Sean Holland	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF)
Kent Kohlhasse	Municipal Manager, Mayor's Office
Emma Pokon	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC), Air Quality
Kevin Cross	MOA/Municipal Assembly
Daniel Volland	MOA/Municipal Assembly

Also in attendance:

Name	Representing
Aaron Jongenelen	AMATS
Jon Cecil	AMATS
Chelsea Ward-Waller	AMATS
Mook Puttong	AMATS
James Starzec	DOT&PF
Ben White*	DOT&PF
Craig Lyon*	MOA/Planning Department
Luke Bowland*	DOT&PF
Will Taygan	Chugach Mountain Bike Riders
Mark Eisenman	DOT&PF
Adeyemi Alimi*	ADEC
Brad Coy*	MOA/Traffic Engineering Dept.
Zakary Hartman	MOA/Traffic Engineering Dept.
Kelly Rawalt	ADEC
Nancy Pease	
Linsey Hajduk	NeighborWorks Alaska
John Linnell	DOT&PF
Adam Moser	DOT&PF
Brandon Telford	MOA/Project Management & Engineering (PM&E)

**AMATS Technical Advisory Committee Member*

***Designated Assembly Alternate*

1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

CHAIR HOLLAND called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. Kent Kohlhase, Municipal Manager, represented Mayor Bronson. A quorum was established prior to the arrivals of Ms. Pokon at 1:04 p.m. and Assembly Member Volland at 1:05 p.m.

2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

AARON JONGENELEN encouraged public involvement in this meeting of the AMATS Policy 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.

Ms. Pokon joined the meeting virtually at 1:04 p.m.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. KOHLHASE moved to approve the agenda. ASSEMBLY MEMBER CROSS seconded.

Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved.

Assembly Member Volland arrived at 1:05 p.m.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – December 21, 2023

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND moved to approve the minutes. MR. KOHLHASE seconded.

Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.

5. ACTION ITEMS

a. 2023-2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment #2

MR. JONGENELEN noted that this amendment was discussed by the Policy Committee at their December 21, 2023, meeting and postponed, allowing the committee additional time to review the document. The AMATS 2023-2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is needed to update Table 2: Roadway, Table 3: Non-motorized, Table 4: Plans and Studies, Table 5: Congestion Mitigation Air Quality, Table 7: HSIP, Table 8: NHS, Table 9: Transit, and Table 10: Other Federal, State, and Local Funded projects within the AMATS area. These changes meet the requirements outlined in the AMATS Operating Agreement, Section 6.6.1., and Policies and Procedures #5. The committee is being asked to release TIP Amendment #2 for a 45-day public comment period. During that period, AMATS will present it to the Assembly for their review and comments and will then bring the TIP amendment, with all the comments having been incorporated, back before the committees in April for final action.

CHAIR HOLLAND opened the floor to public comments.

WILL TAYGAN

MS. POKON moved to approve. MR. KOHLHASE seconded.

CHAIR HOLLAND restated that the motion is to, “Approve to advance to a 45-day public comment period.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER CROSS expressed that he did not intend to support the motion for the following reasons:

1. He continued to have reservations about the \$5 million given to the Port for a project that should not be in the TIP.
2. There are three schools that feed that section of road, which is part of the reason it was considered a large project.
3. It claims to be five miles long, but, realistically, it does not need to start at Mile 0 but should start around Mile 3 and could be much smaller in order to provide benefit.
4. Unfortunately, Eagle River is not allowed to plan for this. The \$2.5 million was to be included in this for planning, and it is often said that they will do something like that in the future, but if we are not even going to fund the planning and design for the project, then there is no way to take little bites out of this elephant.
5. The non-motorized and motorized all get lumped together and labeled too large of a project, and we just do not do it. The surrounding communities say we do not meet the qualifications under how projects are rated and under the equity agreement. He recommended that they drive the Chugiak and Birchwood areas and observe how many people live on large lots but have been living in mobile homes for 20-30 years, and find that, because of the density, they do not meet the qualifications.
6. There is a lot of underserved community that continues to be ignored. Here we are again with Eagle River being passed up.
7. Ten years of non-motorized projects. The only non-motorized projects completed in Eagle River were done with their own funds using their own tax dollars and through CBERRRSA (Chugiak/Birchwood/Eagle River Rural Road Service Area), and a \$1.2 million grant for a wildly dilapidated section of bicycle trail they had tried unsuccessfully for years to get fixed and finally went to the state for funding to fix it.
8. He did not think the design should be removed.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND referred to Complete Streets Table 2, noting that it is interesting to consider various forms of equity and was glad to have in the scoring criteria for consideration disadvantaged populations, etcetera. When hearing about geographic equity, he noticed that there are a lot of South Anchorage projects, such as the O'Malley Road Reconstruction, Rabbit Creek Road Rehabilitation, Potter Drive Rehabilitation, Mountain Air Drive, and Academy Drive/Vanguard Drive, and was wondering if there is an opportunity to put one of those projects further out in the TIP and make it illustrative in order to take a more bite-sized chunk of the Eagle River Road Rehabilitation project. He understood there cannot be \$60 million on the TIP, but can there be a couple of miles of the non-motorized element that the community has expressed a desire for? He would be interested in amending this before releasing it for public comment to that effect if there was a will by the Body to do so. Some of these projects have either a local or state match.

MR. JONGENELEN provided the following information on a few of the projects Assembly Member Volland just mentioned:

1. A number of these projects are in South Anchorage, but a lot of them are holdovers from previous TIPs that have been moving forward. Projects do take a considerable amount of time to move forward.
2. Mountain Air Drive, for example, was not a high-scoring project but the Policy Committee wanted it included regardless, so it was added. Everyone knows the story behind Academy Drive.
3. At this time, he did not know of any projects that could be delayed without a significant impact on the schedule. Research could be done during the public comment period to see if there is an opportunity to move projects. During the public comment period, there could be other changes made by DOT&PF with shifting projects or cost estimates, and funding could become available, providing an opportunity to add a less expensive version of the non-motorized improvements. It is easy for us to separate out the motorized and non-motorized improvements from a project if the committee so desires.

In response to Assembly Member Volland's request for amendment language, MR. JONGENELEN suggested adding Eagle River Loop Road to Mile High Avenue as an Illustrative project in Active Transportation, Table 3. This pathway is similar to a project that already exists in the 2040 MTP, so it would meet that criteria as long as we follow that project. It would also be available during the public comment period to receive feedback, and if funding became available, staff would have justification for bringing it back before the committee.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND moved to amend to add that project as being Illustrative.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND asked if there was a funding amount in the MTP for that project that could also be included in the Illustrative category.

MR. JONGENELEN explained that funding would not be shown for Illustrative because it is technically outside the TIP. He pointed out that when people see the dollar amount in the 2040 MTP, those are old cost estimates, and he would not trust that amount. He does have a request in, based on the committee's last discussion, asking DOT&PF for a cost estimate for this project in order to get a better idea during the public comment period.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND revised his amendment to add to the Active Transportation Table an Illustrative project description for the non-motorized improvements portion of Eagle River Loop Road to Mile High. ASSEMBLY MEMBER CROSS seconded.

CHAIR HOLLAND restated that the amendment is to add an Illustrative project for the non-motorized portion only for Eagle River Loop Road.

First Amendment

Hearing no objections, the amendment passed.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND referred to PLN00019: Non-motorized Facilities Inventory and Mapping in Table 4, Plans and Studies that is being proposed for deletion from the TIP via Amendment #2. It was a strong priority of the Anchorage Assembly, who passed an amendment not only in support of this project but to expand it to include easements, unmapped rights-of-way, etcetera. In meetings with staff, the big issue with this project is that staff does not have the capacity to manage it. He understood that to maintain compliance, AMATS has to do some of these, so not all of these can be deprioritized in order to advance that project. He hoped, at some point, that it was a project that could move forward. He requested that when looking at the Plans and Studies Table, there be a special mark, language, or something that would identify which projects have to move forward to maintain federal compliance. He would be interested in amending this so that when it goes for public comments, the public can see that. His second question was if the Non-motorized Facilities Inventory and Mapping could be kept on the TIP as Illustrative. Are we allowed to do Illustrative planning and studies?

MR. JONGENELEN replied that for any of the projects that AMATS funds, we can make Illustrative as needed to show their continued importance for AMATS. If the committee desires to keep that, and should additional funding and staff time become available, it would be one of the first projects we would look at adding back into the TIP.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND moved to amend to have some type of demarcation in the Plans and Studies Table of which are the ones that have to move forward to maintain federal compliance. ASSEMBLY MEMBER CROSS seconded.

CHAIR HOLLAND restated that the motion to amend is to delineate which of these plans are required for federal compliance.

Second Amendment***Hearing no objections, the amendment passed.***

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND moved to amend the AMATS Safety Plan (PLN00009) and Non-motorized Facilities Inventory and Mapping (PLN00019) rather than delete them via TIP Amendment #2 to make both of them Illustrative.

MR. JONGENELEN mentioned that the AMATS Safety Plan is mostly complete and is being removed because it is no longer needed.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND revised his amendment to make the AMATS Non-motorized Facilities Inventory and Mapping (PLN00019) Illustrative rather than delete it via TIP Amendment #2. ASSEMBLY MEMBER CROSS seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER CROSS noted that this is just GIS mapping and when he needed a map for trails, he would access “all trails”. What is this doing that a sophisticated mapping system does not do?

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND explained that this is quite a comprehensive project and a large undertaking. The funding has been underquoted and would expand by a decade because it is inventorying all the non-motorized facilities, including sidewalks and trails. The outcome would be that they would put all that information into GIS. If there is an opportunity in the future, he would like to add additional information, such as an inventory of platted easements and public access to various amenities, or just be helpful to people when considering real estate transactions. This project alone would require a lot of expertise and time, but it is very important, and the Assembly made a strong case that this is something that should be prioritized. He would prefer to keep it the next ‘go’ on a future TIP.

MR. JONGENELEN further explained how this came about: when the non-motorized plan was being developed for AMATS, there was a gap in the available information regarding what actual physical facilities exist in every location within the AMATS portion of the Municipality of Anchorage. The idea was to bring this project forward and map all of that for us, so we can see if a road has just a sidewalk, a pathway, is it a separated pathway, or is it buffered. Staff and the committees need that type of information to make informed decisions about projects that are moving forward because we are often unsure of what is out there and find out things are radically different from what we anticipated when we do visit the site. As a result, these could lead to cost increases or projects that would have to change, and that becomes a huge problem. This would make all that information available in a GIS system to everyone, for whatever the need. It is a monumental undertaking, and will require a lot of work and is being shown in the TIP amendment as being removed, but it is an important project for AMATS to keep in mind as time goes forward.

Third Amendment

Hearing no objections, the amendment passed.

CHAIR HOLLAND restated that the main motion is to move the TIP to a 45-day public comment period, as amended to keep the Eagle River project in as Illustrative, to delineate the Plans and Studies Table to show which are required by federal process, and to keep PLN0019 in the TIP as Illustrative.

Main Motion, As Amended

Hearing no objections, the main motion, as amended, passed.

- b. Draft 2020 Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Boundary
2010 MPO Boundary**

MR. JONGENELEN noted that the 2020 AMATS Area Boundary includes the 2020 Urban Boundary and all areas where AMATS (the MPO) funds can be expended. The U.S. Census Bureau released the updated Urbanized Areas (UZA) maps after the completion of the 2020 Decennial Census, making it necessary to modify the boundary of the MPO based upon the newly released maps. The Census designates UZA based on population densities and follows Block Group boundaries, typically resulting in an irregular shape that does not necessarily meet the needs from a transportation planning, funding, and reporting standpoint. Federal Transportation Law allows states and MPO's to adjust the Census UZA to meet transportation needs. The adjusted boundary can be bigger, but it cannot be smaller than the boundary provided by FHWA.

CHAIR HOLLAND asked the following questions with responses noted in *Italic*.

- (SH) The Mat-Su Borough MPO boundary looks different than AMATS' boundary and is pretty much the UZA, and our boundary is twice as big. With regard to some of the Hillside areas that have been included, do we think that growth will ever get to the density that would warrant being in the MPO, and, regardless of whether we think so or not, what are the benefits to those communities that have LRSAs (Limited Road Service Areas) from being in the MPO?
- (AJ) *Something tricky about MPO boundaries is that once you have set them, it is easy to expand and include areas, but very difficult to remove them. The benefit to being part of an MPO boundary enables us to utilize our federal funds in any location within our boundary. If the Hillside areas were not in our boundary, we could not use our TIP or UPWP funding there. Indian, Bird, and Girdwood are not part of our boundary and will not have enough density, and there is not enough space. We are allowed what is referred to as hops, skips, and jumps to basically jump from one location to the next, but it has to be within one mile. That is why there is a small gap in the Eklutna area between boundaries.*
- (SH) With regard to the Glenn and Seward Highways where the Seward Highway crosses Potter Marsh, maybe that is in DOT&PF's definition of the Urban Highway and, likewise, towards Eagle River that only half of that highway is currently included. Those would be STIP projects anyway. Are those within the Urban boundary for DOT&PF? If not, what benefit do those highways get from being in the MPO?
- (AJ) *He thought the Glenn Highway was within the urban boundary for DOT&PF. It would have to be verified, but he thought portions of the Seward Highway south were. It is hard to say what benefit there is other than that it allows us to utilize our funding to assist where needed for future projects and to ensure that it is incorporated into our entire planning process. What we are responsible for as an MPO is making sure that all roads within our boundary, whether we actually put a project on there or not, are incorporated in the MTP or the CMP (Congestion Management Process). For AMATS, it is a benefit because it is part of the process to know what DOT&PF is doing on the Glenn Highway for improvements and how that is going to impact Anchorage or*

Chugiak/Eagle River. There is the possibility that AMATS may need to step in and put money toward the Glenn Highway.

(SH) That seemed a bit awkward with our Seward 98 to 118 project because we are dealing with that last mile or two being within AMATS' boundary, but he did not see any harm.

(AJ) *The problem you will run into is: if you do not want it within AMATS' boundary, what is the justification for it? FHWA is not looking for justification such as "not wanting the MPO to be involved in the process, or the MPO not to make a decision on this road, so it should not be within their boundary". There has to be a strong, justifiable reason why it should not be in the MPO boundary, and that is very hard to do these days.*

There were no public comments.

MR. KOHLHASE moved to approve the updated AMATS boundary map. ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

c. Alaska DOT&PF Policy & Procedure (P&P) for Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Cooperation

MR. JONGENELEN informed the committee that he had recently attended a STIP meeting with DOT&PF and was provided a P&P regarding MPO cooperation because they have a desire to more formalize the cooperation between them. The MPOs will be attending the quarterly meeting this Friday to discuss this further, so any comments the committee might have would be beneficial. The Technical Advisory Committee had reviewed this, and their comments have been incorporated into the letter drafted by AMATS and included with the P&P. AMATS already has cooperation documents on the development of our MTP, TIP, and UPWP for the MPO in our Operating Agreement and Public Participation Plan. The P&P document is a bit confusing in stating how DOT&PF and MPOs will cooperate on the development of these documents since they already exist in a federally required operating agreement. AMATS' Operating Agreement and Public Participation Plan are the ones that matter, and this P&P should not supersede them. The first paragraph in the Authority Section of the draft letter is attempting to make it clear that the MPO is responsible for all roads within our boundary, regardless of their classification or who owns them. If you are spending federal money on it, then it has to be part of the transportation planning process. AMATS' transportation planning process is done through the MTP, the TIP, the CMP, and the federal performance measures. The performance measures that we have to set are typically on NHS (National Highway Systems) routes, and we, as AMATS, have the opportunity to set our own measures for most of them. We just want everyone to understand that it is more nuanced than what this letter says. It looks as if this P&P was creating more effort for AMATS' staff, and it is internal for DOT&PF, but a request for information from AMATS staff on projects anticipated with corresponding funding and how they would be shared was part of this P&P. That is already provided in the TIP, and

AMATS is encouraging everyone at DOT&PF to continually utilize the TIP because we are constantly updating and managing that program. Staff time is limited and set by the Policy Committee through the UPWP.

CHAIR HOLLAND recused himself from participating in the matter and relinquished the gavel to Mr. Kohlase.

MS. POKON felt it was appropriate to recuse herself from participating for purposes of communication to another principal state agency.

The following were committee comments and questions with responses noted in *Italic*.

- (KC) He asked for clarification that the letter is asking the Policy Committee to review the DOT&PF policy document and approve the letter with any additional comments. His understanding was that AMATS was already operating under this procedural plan. What does this achieve? Is there an example where this is not currently being adhered to?
- (AJ) *He explained that this P&P is brand new for DOT&PF staff. This letter is to just provide DOT&PF comments on the P&P to help them refine it, making it clearer what its intent and purpose are. Most of the cooperation between DOT&PF and the MPOs is done on an informal basis, and the intent of this P&P is to make it more formalized, so it is easier for new DOT&PF staff members not familiar with MPOs to know what the process is for certain portions of cooperation. This only covers a few things. The committee is not voting on the approval of the P&P itself, just the letter with the comments from the TAC and if the Policy Committee has any additional comments. This is an internal DOT&PF P&P, and AMATS does not approve it.*
- (DV) He referred to the last line in the Authority section that reads, “For AMATS, this process is done as part of the MTP, TIP, CMP, and federal performance measures development.” He is interested in adding a line that would capture any facts related to the STIP’s compliance with the MTP and the TIP. We recently learned during the STIP process, with the letter the committee forwarded regarding it, that projects in the STIP have to be on the MTP or the TIP.
- (AJ) *In order for a project in an MPO boundary to be in the STIP, it is required to on both the MTP and the TIP, or consistent with.*
- (DV) Is there any benefit or effect to adding a line to the Authority section comment?
- (AJ) *It could be beneficial for AMATS to add something clarifying the requirements for the STIP. The only reason he is hesitant is that there has been a lot of pushback from DOT&PF on this.*

(KC) Did Tract J follow that procedure?

(DV) *The Tract J Emergency Access Road was added to the STIP and should probably not have been because it was not in the TIP or the MTP.*

(KC) He pointed out that if the committee is going to set these requirements, then we should follow our own guidance.

(DV) *Tract J was added to the MTP at our last meeting.*

There were no public comments.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND moved to approve sending the letter to the DOT&PF Deputy Commissioner. ASSEMBLY MEMBER CROSS seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND moved to amend to add a line to the end of the Authority Section that reads, "Furthermore, projects on the STIP should have been previously programmed on the MTP or the TIP."

MR. JONGENELEN explained that the problem is that projects are supposed to be on those documents before being added to the STIP. However, not everyone agrees that this is the case, and projects are added to the STIP regularly without being added to the MTP and TIP.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND expressed that this is an AMATS perspective as approved by the AMATS Policy Committee. Folks may have a different opinion, but this is our assertion, and he wanted to make sure it reflected the opinions of staff and the committee. He is not as concerned about the opinions of other entities and wanted to capture the reality that in order to be programmed on the STIP, projects should already be programmed within the MTP or the TIP.

MR. JONGENELEN suggested the language could read, "Furthermore, projects within the MPO boundary must be programmed in the MTP and TIP prior to being added to the STIP." The project has to be in both the MTP and the TIP.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND revised his amendment to add a line to the end of the Authority section that reads, "Furthermore, projects within the MPO boundary must be programmed in the MTP and TIP prior to being added to the STIP." ASSEMBLY MEMBER CROSS seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND explained that he wanted to bolster this assertion if there is a new Policy & Procedure being evaluated, that we really do have authority for planning and roadways that use federal funding within AMATS' boundary. We have seen a recent example when it came to the STIP planning process where there was a clash and a lack of understanding of how the STIP needs to be consistent with those. As a matter of public record, the committee sending this letter is an important corollary to the rest of this comment.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER CROSS understood the problem Assembly Member Volland is trying to resolve, but he was curious if there were any unintended consequences and what problems this might create. Where would this change possibly create difficulties?

MR. JONGENELEN pointed out that it is just AMATS making comments to DOT&PF about their P&P and they could technically say thank you but not be interested and just move on. From his technical perspective, this just provides clarity on what the 3C transportation planning process is supposed to do as spelled out in federal regulation. He did not see it as a problem.

Hearing no objections, the amendment passed 3 to 0, with 2 recused.

Hearing no objections, the main motion, as amended, passed 3 to 0, with 2 recused.

Mr. Kohlhase returned the gavel to Chair Holland.

**d. Transportation Systems Management & Operations (TSMO) Draft Plan
Transportation Systems Management & Operations Draft Appendices**

A PowerPoint prepared by Ms. Schuette was presented to the committee in her absence.

MR. JONGENELEN briefed the committee on the Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSMO) Plan, noting that it is the first of its kind in the region. It identifies strategies to make the most of the existing infrastructure before adding new pavement. Transportation Demand Management (TDM), Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), traditional traffic operations, and connected and autonomous vehicles are all TSMO strategies.

There were no comments.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER CROSS moved to approve the TSMO Plan. ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

6. PROJECT AND PLAN UPDATES

a. 2023 4th Quarter Obligation Report

MR. JONGENELEN provided an overview of the report, noting this is for federal fiscal year quarters, not a calendar year making it through the end of September 30, 2023.

There were no comments.

b. 2023 4th Quarter Project Updates

MR. JONGENELEN briefed the committee and recognized Mr. Starzec for creating this update report.

CHAIR HOLLAND opened the floor to public comments.

JAMES STARZEC reminded the committee that should they have questions regarding any of the projects listed in the report, the project managers names are included with every project and are always available.

7. GENERAL INFORMATION

MR. JONGENELEN mentioned that members of both the TAC and PC had requested additional time to review documents. In an effort to accommodate that, staff is adjusting their process to provide information earlier for review. The General Information Items on each agenda will now include a routine update explaining what will be heard on the following months' agenda. For example, February will have the 2050 MTP and the AMATS Safety Plan before you for approval. In addition, staff's intent is to send large documents or contentious items that require a lot of review much earlier. Typically, staff waits until items are posted to the agenda to send them to the committees, but this will be adjusted slightly. The 2050 MTP will be distributed to the members either today or tomorrow and will be asking for final approval. The Safety Plan should be provided to the members early next week, allowing multiple weeks for review, and this will also be for final approval. The intent is not to make changes to the documents between sending them for review and when they go before the committees. That will continue as part of our process, which is for action during the regular meetings.

MR. KOHLHASE expressed his appreciation to staff for providing the documents earlier, allowing additional time to review and prepare for the meeting.

8. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

MR. KOHLHASE sent well wishes to Ms. Schuette.

MR. JONGENELEN commented that AMATS is currently short-staffed, with Ms. Schuette being out until April and a vacant position. He commended Ms. Ward-Waller, Mr. Cecil, and Ms. Putton for their invaluable work.

CHAIR HOLLAND pointed out that an AMATS 101 training presentation is on the website and could have value for new committee members. DOT&PF offered the Anchorage Assembly Transportation Committee training by planners on the federal process.

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

10. ADJOURNMENT

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND moved to adjourn. MS. POKON seconded.

Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 2:21 p.m.

Draft Minutes