

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

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

**June 23, 2022
1:30 PM**

*This meeting is available for viewing at
[Transportation Planning / AMATS Meetings \(muni.org\)](http://Transportation Planning / AMATS Meetings (muni.org))*

Due to the expected absence of Chair Junge, Todd Vanhove acted as Chair.

Policy Committee Members Present:

Name	Representing
Todd Vanhove*	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF)
Adam Trombley	Director, MOA Community Development
Emma Pokon	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC), Air Quality
Meg Zaletel	MOA/Municipal Assembly
Forrest Dunbar	MOA/Municipal Assembly

Also in attendance:

Name	Representing
Aaron Jongenelen	MOA/Planning Department
Christine Schuette	MOA/Planning Department
Joni Wilm	MOA/Planning Department
Jon Cecil	MOA/Planning Department
Craig Lyon*	MOA/Planning Department
Sean Baski	DOT&PF
James Starzec	DOT&PF
Steven Rzepka	DOT&PF
Van Le	R&M Consultants
Randy Brown	
Daniel Volland	
Jessie Doherty	
Cindy Heil*	ADEC
Brad Coy*	MOA/Traffic Engineering Department
Cheryl Richardson	
Nancy Pease	
Ben Coleman	R&M Consultants

**AMATS Technical Advisory Committee Member*

***Designated Assembly Alternate*

1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

ACTING CHAIR VANHOVE called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m. Adam Trombley, Community Development Director represented Mayor Bronson. A quorum was established.

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.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to approve the agenda. ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR seconded.

MR. JONGENELEN requested to postpone Item 6.a. “AMATS Transportation Network, Model Presentation” to July as the consultants were unable to attend this meeting.

Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved, as amended.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – May 26, 2022

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to approve the minutes. MS. POKON seconded.

Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.

5. ACTION ITEMS

a. 2023 Safety Targets

MR. JONGENELEN explained that the Safety Performance Management (Safety PM) is part of the overall Transportation Performance Management (TPM) program, which The Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) defines as a strategic approach that uses system information to make investment and policy decisions to achieve national performance goals. The Safety PM Final Rule supports the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), as it establishes safety performance measure requirements for the purpose of carrying out the HSIP and to assess fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.

The following questions and comments were made by the Committee with responses noted in *Italic*.

- (FD) Agreed with AMATS creating their own safety targets and that they should be significantly more aggressive than the state’s targets. With regard to the fatalities being ≤ 70 shown on the graph, he asked if this was statewide or

within our area. He did not understand why these were not broken up into portions. For example, we only had ten traffic fatalities, but the Valley had 100 fatalities.

- (AJ) *All are statewide targets, and it is required that one target be set for the state in its entirety. When setting these targets, it was understood that there is not the ability to drill down into the data to be able to assign fatalities for our area only. We want to do our own safety plan so that we can identify that data and be able to say we are still supporting the state's targets, but are limiting the targets to our area and account for the fatalities. It will only encompass AMATS' area and will not include Girdwood or south of Potter Marsh on the Seward Highway as they are outside our boundary.*
- (MZ) Since this is a statewide target, what is the intersection between the target, the data, and the distribution of the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funding?
- (AJ) *These performance measures are included in the HSIP annual report and contribute towards meeting the targets. If the targets are not met and a penalty is imposed on the state (as it happened here), then the state will be required to spend more of its HSIP funding on vulnerable road users. The state had already reached out to us because they have a certain percentage threshold of HSIP funding that has to be spent in areas with high numbers of fatalities and injuries to help address those concerns.*
- (MZ) So we do not just have an aggregate number, we actually have some kind of geographic basis for diving a level deeper to know where the HSIP funding might be directed or targeted?
- (AJ) *HSIP does its own analysis of each corridor where there are concerns. His understanding is that it comes to the certification of the data. We get the data and then certify it as a target, overall, for the state. There is not a certified number for our particular area or the MatSu Borough area, which is why we are behind. The certified data that is available right now is from 2019 and the 2020 certified data is currently being worked on.*
- (MZ) The reason for the question is if we are going to look at doing our own targets for the MPO, it would be interesting to know what intersection is between that and the HSIP data where those particularly vulnerable populations and corridors are and know what tools we have available to meet whatever localized goal we set.
- (AJ) *As part of the Non-Motorized Plan, Ms. Wilm works closely with Scott Thomas in Traffic on HSIP related to non-motorized users and they did input information to the non-motorized corridors and provided HSIP with safety data for those corridors. For the non-motorized users, we at least have some data available, and the safety plan will drill down into that a little more to help identify the cause and an action plan on how to address that.*

- (MZ) That is good to know. She will follow up with Ms. Wilm because she is curious what the non-motorized corridors encompass since we do have a lot of pedestrian fatalities and she did not know if some of those are considered to be using a non-motorized or motorized facility at the time. That information will influence where we want to set our target in the MPO.

There were no public comments.

MR. TROMBLEY moved to approve. ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

b. Destination UMED: Transportation Demand Management Study – Public Involvement Plan

JON CECIL informed the Committee that the Destination UMED (More Travel Choices, More Opportunities) Transportation Demand Management (TDM) study is a recommended action of the UMED District Plan (2016). It will define a policy framework and craft an actionable toolkit to advance realistic implementation of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) in the UMED District to reduce traffic congestion, improve mobility choice and equitable access, and support economic development for the next decade. This study is guided by a 17-member advisory committee that will seek input from a diverse set of stakeholders to build community consensus and secure buy-in. Opportunities for community input will include a travel survey, stakeholder interview, community workshops, and public comment on project documents.

The following questions and comments were made by the Committee with responses noted in *Italic*.

- (FD) Referred to page 12 noting that he spoke with one of the stakeholders listed and she had requested two small text amendments, but he was not sure of the amendment process.
- (AJ) *The Committee can include the amendments as part of the approval.*
- (MZ) She realized this was based off a community council, but the northern boundary on Northern Lights cuts through near Tikishla Park, and not too far away is Alaska Regional Hospital, North Star Behavioral Health, and other medical infrastructure. She was curious why that was not included in the study versus using a community council district boundary, which does not necessarily capture all the assets related to the circulation of traffic for emergency medical purposes.
- (JC) *This question was also raised by the TAC. Prior to the project getting kicked off, the boundary was discussed and we were looking at the entire Bowl. This Committee narrowed it down to the boundaries of what came out of the 2016 UMED District Plan, so that is what this reflects. It does not prohibit us from*

having those conversations, for example, reaching out to Alaska Regional Hospital about the outcomes from this, but the specific boundaries are as communicated in the plan.

- (MZ) What ways will the plan take into account those other major medical facilities, particularly, Alaska Regional and the impacts of that facility within this study and/or the impact of people coming in off the highway to access emergency medical services? Do you also get EMS data, such as transit times?
- (JC) *We will be reaching out to receive the best data we can and have also been talking to EMS and Police and Fire Departments about response times and number of trips. This is all part of the data collection during Phase 1.*
- (FD) He did not think the neighborhood east of Boniface considers themselves to be UMED. If you are looking for a way to limit the size or change the shape of the district to pull in part of the area that Assembly Member Zaletel mentioned, he thinks you could take off the residential portions east of Boniface, especially those closer to Baxter Road and Campbell Airstrip Road. Would it save any money if you were to move that eastern border to Boniface?
- (JC) *He did not think so. We are in a 14-month timeframe beginning in mid-April, so we are well underway with a limited amount of funds to do these projects. There is a mailing list that people can access on the website and notices will be mailed to the public and to the Federation of Community Councils. Every household within this border will receive a notice.*
- (FD) Taking hundreds of homes and restricting the border will not save money on mailings?
- (AJ) *It could but the problem is that we are following the MOA's UMED District Plan with this border. To make a rush change while in the middle of this project supports what the public accuses AMATS of doing by not following the plans. We are following the UMED District Plan. His recommendation is that if this border is not acceptable to people, then the MOA needs to update their plan.*

ACTING CHAIR VANHOVE opened the floor to public comments.

NANCY PEASE expressed that this same concern with the boundary exists on the south side. The neighborhoods on either side of Tudor Road are integrated into the UMED District.

MR. CECIL clarified that we do include the community council south of Tudor Road, which is one of four community councils for primary approval to this project because they are adjacent to UMED, and that was taken into account.

MS. PEASE added that the study area boundary was drawn down Tudor Road.

MR. CECIL reiterated that the study was based on the 2016 District Plan.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR moved to approve. ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR moved to amend page 12 to add the name, Peter Mjos, Rogers Park Community Council President, to the list of stakeholders as the primary contact. ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL seconded.

MR. CECIL pointed out that Mr. Mjos' name was inadvertently left off because this was completed prior to contacting him. As a result of Mr. Mjos not knowing we were the ones attempting to contact him, Mr. Mjos did not respond to my email or telephone requests. They did eventually come in contact and Mr. Mjos was invited to the stakeholder meeting.

AMENDMENT #1

Hearing no objections, the amendment passed.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR moved to amend page 18 to change the Public Review Draft 60-day review date from April 2023 to April 1, 2023. ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR noted that the stakeholder requesting this felt that if it came out later in April, there would not be enough time to pass things at their May meeting.

MR. JONGENELEN pointed out that often these schedules are shifting and by putting in an exact date, it makes it very difficult because we may not achieve that date. What if we set it for April 2nd or 3rd of 2023? It sounds ridiculous, but we do have members of the public who are watching AMATS constantly to find fault, so we use just the month allowing for flexibility.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR understood that but the concern is that if it comes out later in April there will not be enough time, so maybe April 4, 2023, would work?

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR revised his amendment of the review date to April 4, 2023. ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR heard what Mr. Jongenelen was saying but thought that was sort of the point of the UMED, which is to make it a little more certain and then the community councils can draft and pass their documents in time for the deadline.

In response to Mr. Trombley's question regarding the process as the Policy Committee that if the deadline were not April 4th, would we have to amend this, MR. JONGENELEN explained that the reason for not putting in specific dates is because it does give us that flexibility. Should we not meet the date, he was unsure what the process would be because AMATS does not normally do that. His understanding is that this could be amended at a later date, but that would take an entire month with having to bring it back before this Committee for approval. If the public comment period were to take longer or more time is

needed to review documents, then that date might shift on its own.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL is hopeful that those working on this project would see the delay coming and it would not be a surprise, and could accommodate the month to bring it back. We could reset expectations as well as when that final study was to come out. She appreciated the target date of June 2023, but if that means we have all the comments due over the summer where we had basically disenfranchised community councils from doing the work we want them to do, then maybe we should look at pushing out that final study date. That is the reality of this work and it would be very appropriate to come back and say this is the situation and we see it will run right into the summer, so let us push it back and reset the expectations knowing participation during the summer is usually low. This is a very important project to those in this area and they have been asking for this a really long time. She is comfortable with no later than April because we have tools at our disposal to mitigate the concerns she is hearing from Mr. Jongeneelen. We can mitigate that as long as we are tracking it.

MR. JONGENELEN further explained that the majority of the reasons for these final dates is because of the federal agreements put in place between FHWA and the State, or AMATS and the MOA and the State. It is not as simple as just pushing it back, it is changing the agreements and getting FHWA to approve that our ending date is now pushed out an extra few months, or so. Of course it is whatever the Committee decides, but he just wanted to everyone to be aware that there is a lot more that goes into it than just coming back before the Committee to push it out a few more months in order to skip the summer.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to amend the amendment to no later than February 15, 2023, for the public comment period to begin. ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL explained that the purpose for her amendment is to put us somewhere in the middle of this community workshop. We can kick off the public comment period, which one of the purposes of the community workshops (as well as to get community feedback) is to have these two things coincide and work together and does not seem to be at odds. It also accommodates any potential delays and allows for some wiggle room to still provide community councils a full 60 days, and not press up against your project deadline. It is a way to balance the interests and the potential complications of pushing out the project deadline, while also still getting what you are looking for, which is having public comments and a public review draft.

MR. JONGENELEN believed the community workshop is before the draft document is completed. It is helping to finalize the draft document, so it will not be done in time to release it to the public at that point.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL expressed that what she is hearing is that this is the schedule that is set and there can never be any adjustments to it without extreme complications. That is not an acceptable response to her if we are making a policy choice here. If we are making a policy choice that is meant to foster public participation, then we need to figure out the right way to meet the needs of both the project as well as to get that public participation. It seems it would be possible to figure that out. If there is a better suggested date because what she is hearing is that the April date, in and of itself, is not

sufficient or setting a specific date because pushing the project is a no. She is open for suggestions and is hoping to spur that conversation to find the right fit.

In response to Mr. Jongenele's question to contact the consultants to see if it could be pushed back to March instead of April, MR. CECIL will certainly ask them. That would give us our 60 days and complete it before the June deadline and before summertime.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR would be comfortable with releasing it in March. That is more important than the fact that it is a little bit earlier than a set date in April.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL agreed and the reason for her amendment was to figure out where is the spot.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL withdrew her amendment to the amendment.
ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR withdrew his amendment. ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL seconded.

AMENDMENT #2

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR moved to amend the date from April to March 2023.
ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL seconded.

Hearing no objections, the amendment passed.

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

c. Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Appointment

JONI WILM briefed the Committee on the appointment recommendation of Jessie Doherty adding that she is replacing Carol Fink.

There were no comments.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to approve. ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

d. 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Program (MTP) Performance Measures - 2050 MTP Criteria – Comment/Response Summary - Charts Summary

MR. JONGENELEN informed the Committee that the 2050 MTP Performance Measures and Criteria recently went through a 30-day public comment period in which they received 199 comments from 12 individuals or entities; and were updated based on the feedback.

Performance measures aim to make all objectives measurable and allow progress and performance to be tracked over time. Specific targets for these performance measures will be determined following performance measure approval, and the determination of who, when, and how often applicable data will be collected and reported once these have been established.

The following questions and comments were made by the Committee with responses noted in *Italic*.

- (MZ) With regard to the timeline for the development of the 2050 MTP, is this a must pass today item?
- (AJ) *If it is delayed, no, it would not affect the schedule. We would appreciate it being passed today so we can continue moving forward, but we are still in the nomination period. If it is not passed today, it needs to be passed next month because we will close the nomination period by that point and will start getting the projects in order, and we will need to know where the criteria is at in order to get the scoring sheets ready.*
- (FD) There are a lot of comments that staff had not had a chance to respond to or have all the comments been responded to and integrated? Is staff aware of any comments received after the public comment period? Have the comments received already been reviewed by staff and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), or just staff?
- (AJ) *All the comments submitted during the comment period have been responded to and integrated. If they were submitted after the comment period, they would not be included in the comment/response summary. Members of the public like to send emails one hour prior to the meeting asking for their comments to be included, so he does not count those. Once comments come in and the public comment period is closed, everything is entered into the comment/response summary. For this period, he parsed it out to the project team asking them to assist with responding to everything. Each person on the project team received a portion of this comment/response summary to provide responses to because they each have their own area of expertise giving us more of an integrated approach. Once we have all the changes and responses from staff, we then bring all this to the TAC meeting for review and propose any changes to what staff recommended. What the Committee has before them, today, is staff's recommendations and the TAC recommendation, which was to approve it as is. The TAC did not have any additional recommendations.*
- (MZ) Why is there not a reason given for the “no recommended change”? It is hard to have conversations with those who are seeking the recommended change as to the rationale of AMATS and the TAC pushing these through, and then adoption by this Committee.
- (AJ) *The rationale is noted under “staff response”, which is the column before the staff recommendations.*

- (MZ) Those rationales were reviewed by the TAC and determined the comments were sufficient. She appreciated that this is a lot of work and how the community engages in this because it is really important since the community has to live with whatever it is that passes at the Policy Committee.
- (FD) In reviewing a couple of comments he received today, there seems to be the perception that there is no target for Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), then he noticed one staff comment mentioned that VMT is something AMATS does use. Any idea why there might be that misperception?
- (AJ) *We have not yet set targets for the performance measures because we need to know what the performance measures are before we do the work to study the targets. Some performance measures may not have targets in this go around because we do not have the data available. His thought process, as the project manager on this, was that if we do not have the data then we cannot do it. Instead, we get the measure, recognize we do not have the data, then start working to get the data, and move forward with setting targets. VMT is in this document and we do have the ability to calculate VMT, and we will be looking at it as part of it, but we just have not set the targets yet and are waiting until we know what the performance measures are. It is a lot of work to do performance measures and if the Committee cut the performance measures out of this, we need to know that prior to doing all the work.*

ACTING CHAIR VANHOVE opened the floor to public comments.

NANCY PEASE noted that if the Committee and staff are not ready to establish performance measure targets now, she was wondering whether the Committee might include in its findings that these are still in some sort of draft form, and are in need of further revision to incorporate emerging targets as well as to incorporate local adopted plans. We have a VisionZero adopted plan and, from that, there should be a target. We have an Anchorage Climate Action Plan and, from that, we should be prepared to adopt a target for Greenhouse Gas Emissions. With regard to land use infill and redevelopment, we should have some measurable targets there as well, and that is noted in her letter. One that is pretty easy to measure is percent of developable urban acreage that is roadways and parking. The more lanes and, especially, the more parking you have is a good measure of how auto-dependent you are, and how compact and walkable you are. The other concept the public repeatedly referred to as the 15-minute walkable neighborhood is a concept used in many other communities and is something that can be measured. These might be new to some of you today, but if you could adopt an intent to refine these performance measures further to include emerging targets, that would be some reassurance to the public in keeping with the concept of the Federal Highway Planning 3C (Continuing, Comprehensive, and Cooperative) criteria, which AMATS is presumably operating under.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to postpone to July. ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL would like the opportunity to provide some language and work cooperatively with staff to possibly provide some of those amendments that have been

requested, especially around the local plans. She sees them somewhat referenced in here but, as we move into the targets, making sure those local plans are fully integrated is particularly important in an MTP where we do not have a separate Anchorage-based Long-Range Transportation Plan that reflects the goals and objectives of our local planning efforts.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR pointed out that Ms. Pease had made a few specific suggestions and his understanding is that, during public comment, we do not have a direct response from staff to the public. He asked Mr. Jongenele if he had any response to her ideas. For example, to make some type of note that it is in “draft” form. Should we have some indication that it is in draft form and do you think we should have some measure that captures developable land that is parking and car infrastructure? He saw in the summary that parking is outside the purview of AMATS.

MR. JONGENELEN explained that, in terms of how the process works, everything is always in draft until the final document. Even though we have the goals and objectives and whatever the Committee does with the performance measures and criteria, we are basically asking for the Committee’s blessing to move forward with them, as is. That does not mean they will never change between now and the end of the document, so they are always in draft form. The criteria are less in draft form because we will be using them at some point. He can add a note that these are in draft form, but it is already understood they already are and, if other changes come through the process, we can integrate those, if possible. If we need to start completely over, that is not as possible. Language edits or having missed something is easy to integrate and is part of that flexibility as we move forward. In terms of infill redevelopment targets, that is completely outside of AMATS. If this were a local transportation plan, then that would be more appropriate. You could have some kind of measure or criteria that looks at a project coming along and, if it is adding lanes, how much developable land is it removing. That is pretty easy to do and is more appropriate for a criteria than a performance measure. With regard to Greenhouse Gas Emissions, we already said we are going to do a target and this has been addressed multiple times, but we have more work to do before we can get to the target itself. We are putting together a new strategic planning model that will help us look at this and we are working with MOA on their status report that came out recently. We are working forward on it but just do not have it ready at this point.

ACTING CHAIR VANHOVE asked if anyone is in opposition to the motion to postpone.

MR. TROMBLEY stated that he objected to postponing and asked Assembly Member Zaletel for clarification what postponing to July would do.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL reiterated that it allowed her, hopefully, to work cooperatively with AMATS’ staff to capture the intent that targets will 1) both be based on local plans, although, she sees them reflected somewhat in the comments and responses but she thought we needed to be very clear about it; and 2) there is also the intent to include the emerging targets. Just some language clarity addresses some of the concerns we have heard and, hopefully, will not be a lot of work for staff because she intends to help supply some of that language. She is just not prepared to do it on the fly, but thinks there are important additions to add context to the overall performance measures and targets that are before us.

In response to Mr. Trombley's question if this would delay the project in any way, VAN LE with R&M Consultants explained that there is a bit of a schedule impact with the delay. She made it clear that what the Committee is reviewing today is an updated version that included everything noted in red on the draft document, which is based on public comments. This had already gone before and agreed upon by both the TAC and the PC back in February. There was also a joint work session last January with the TAC and the PC. We brought this updated version back before you because of how many public comments were heard and wanting to make sure the Committee reviewed it and provided any additional comments or edits before we move forward. In terms of addressing the schedule impact, what is really key is the prioritization criteria because nominations are going to close July 11. Those have been open for almost two months and we need to use that prioritization criteria to score the projects for our next step, which is putting it into the VisionEval model that Mr. Jongenelen had discussed, and also the Travel Demand Model tasks that are dependent on what you are reviewing today. We can deal with a one-month delay since we have had other delays in the schedule we are trying to integrate as well.

MR. TROMBLEY heard two separate responses. Ms. Le said that it will not cause a delay, but at the same time she said you have a July 11 deadline for projects. Our next AMATS meeting would not be until the end of July. He asked for additional clarification.

MS. LE pointed out that the Committee is reviewing two items today and the request is to delay both until July. Our nominations for projects that the public has been working has a deadline of July 11. The prioritization criteria (not the performance measures) is what we need to use to start scoring the projects, and staff has approximately one month to do that. The delay for the prioritization criteria would impact that part of the MTP. Performance measures could handle the one-month delay giving them another month to review it. If it would help to have another work session, we can do that.

MR. TROMBLEY clarified that it would impact one and not the other one. He asked Assembly Member Zaletel if she would consider moving forward the item that would not be impacted and not postponing the item that would see an impact on scoring those projects.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL noted that the things she wants to do with the policy direction clarity is provide "where is that best suited to be" and asked if that aligns with what the consultant is hoping the outcome will be.

MR. JONGENELEN expressed that that is a tough question because often policy helps drive things like the projects that you select. If setting policy, then you want to make sure your criteria match up with that policy-level change.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL noted that she expressed her concern on record, but these targets are based on local plans, and that we are clear there is this intent to include emerging targets. Is there another time in which we can incorporate that into the MTP where it continues to provide what she thinks is necessary guidance for the projects beyond this moment?

MR. JONGENEN replied, yes, we have a section as part of the MTP that is a policy and action section where you set policies. It could go there, but if you are basically talking about setting some kind of policy on what projects you select, that happens when we do the project

nomination scoring, ranking, and selecting of projects. That is basically the next step. He clarified that Assembly Member Zaletel is wanting to ensure that projects we select for performance measures and the targets we set are helping to incorporate and integrate and follow local plans.

MS. LE is unclear on the policy direction for the performance measures. She summarized the following:

1. This was taken through in February after holding a work session in January.
2. What is different between this MTPs performance measures is that we are going beyond what previous MTPs have done. They only looked at federal targets and performance measures. We are adding in all the local ones, which are shaded in blue in the draft table before you. Those shaded in red are the updates made after the 199 public comments were received. This has already been through a public comment period and the TAC and PC reviewed and approved it when we were able to extend it out for public comment.
3. This is an updated version with all the red shading to clarify the many places we felt the public was right and we needed to update those sections because they did not make sense or were not defined properly as transportation planning.
4. Now is the time to discuss this. We can make the schedule work by moving some things around, if you need more time.
5. The prioritization criteria is what we need to start using to score the projects. We need to have that reviewed and updated before we start working on that in July.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL asked the Committee to vote on her motion. Her final comment is that it seems every time we get to a decision point in AMATS, there is no room for any kind of a pause to add or have policy considerations added, which is the function of this Committee, because everything is always running up against the calendar. It is a flaw in the process, frankly, with the MTP, and it is very frustrating. We are always stuck in a continual loop with, no, we cannot do that because there is not enough time or it will push it back to public comments. At some point, the Policy Committee needs to be able to have the opportunity and the ability to weigh in with policy-based viewpoints that actually affect what is reflected in the MTP.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR appreciated Ms. Le clarifying her comments about the performance measures versus the criteria with the performance measures being something that we can perhaps delay. He realized most of the conversation had been about the measures and felt we might have neglected discussion on the criteria now that the criteria are about to be put into immediate use on July 11 for project nominations.

MR. JONGENELEN pointed out that nominations would be shortly after July 11 because nominations close that day and it will take some time to prepare and with so many projects, he was unsure how soon it would be ready.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR clarified that the criteria had not been impacted by changes at the federal level. If we do vote to delay, the performance measures would not create an issue but the criteria used in July would be the old criteria without the inserts noted in red? Ms. Le made it sound as if the criteria are really needed in July to do some kind of work, but he did not fully understand how these would be used in July.

MR. JONGENELEN explained that the criteria could not be used until the Committee approved them. If this were delayed until July, July would be our must pass meeting as there could not be any additional delays. There is not an exact time when these will be used because we could use them before the next Committee meeting or we could use them afterward. We have to close the nomination period and organize all 400 hundred plus nominations received by adding a description and title to make them readable, since they are basically just comments, and then put them into scoring sheets. It could take more than the two weeks between July 11 and the next Committee meeting but did not think it would be the end of the world if these are delayed until July because we have already had a number of delays. Unlike other projects, we have no ability to negotiate a closed deadline of this project. We cannot push the deadline of this project out from where it currently is because federal regulations assigned us a drop-dead date to get this approved. If it is delayed, he asked the Committee to make sure it is approved in July. If it is done in time, it can go back before the TAC for any questions or comments prior to bringing it back to this Committee.

In response to Ms. Pokon's question if the changes being discussed could be amended later, if it is adopted today, MR. JONGENELEN noted, yes, for the performance measures, but, no, for the criteria. We will have to use the criteria and once we start using them, we cannot make changes to them. Should the Committee decide to delete this criteria and add a new one, then it will require starting the whole process over.

MR. TROMBLEY agreed with Assembly Member Zaletel that we are the Policy Committee and are supposed to discuss policy, but we are abutting up against timelines that prevent us from discussing policy. He agreed with the delay, but then we are delaying other projects and putting them at risk. That is a challenge for him and he cannot support it because of that.

ACTING CHAIR VANHOVE called for a vote.

Yay

Assembly Member Zaletel
Assembly Member Dunbar

Nay

Mr. Trombley
Ms. Pokon
Acting Chair Vanhove

The motion to postpone to July failed 2 to 3.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to approve the MTP Prioritization Criteria.
ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to amend page 5 in the Criterion for Improves ADA Accessibility that currently reads, "Project hinders accessibility for disabled people" to read, "Project hinders accessibility for people experiencing disabilities." ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR seconded.

Hearing no objections, the amendment passed.

MS. WILM appreciated Mr. Trombley's statement in keeping these moving because a work session had already been held and staff had put a lot of effort in moving this forward. She

also heard Assembly Member Zaletel's comment that it feels there is never a time for comments, which is true for AMATS a lot of the time because we have federal requirements and it is very difficult when projects are delayed. The committee that created the performance criteria did a really good job trying to incorporate the local planning efforts. Although, it may look like there are some areas that could be improved and compared to what it had been in the past, it is a very comprehensive effort incorporating all the local plans.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR asked what is the plus zero? He understood why criteria exists, but why specify something as plus zero. In a scoring system, would plus zero just mean no change? With regard to improving the ADA accessibility, the first sentence says, "project purpose and need.." and the second sentence says, "project propose and need...". That could be considered a scrivener's error.

MR. JONGENELEN noted that staff will make the correction from propose to purpose. He added that the plus zero is being retentive and making sure there is a possibility to score a project regardless. It helps when doing the scoring sheets because not putting a number into a column creates problems when summing up the columns. It also denotes that this project is not getting any points because it is not meeting the criteria.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL commented that she did not see a performance measures or criteria work session beyond the 10th work session come through on her calendar. It may have taken place while she was out in May. She does attend the work sessions when there is the opportunity adding that this is not really the time to dig into and wrestle with the language though. It is more overviews and questions about the particular projects in terms of the TIP. In some ways on the policy side of things, she understood why it worked great for the Technical Advisory Committee, but from the policy perspective it is a little bit different. We are awaiting those public comments to come in to really get that public perception. She thought that was the tension with AMATS by being a very technically based thing, but also guiding transportation policy for an area where it impacts the public. She did appreciate the way this particular criteria was laid out as it is really easy to read and digest where you are headed with it. A belated ongoing shout out should be given to John Weddleton because he worked a lot on this in the past to update this criteria.

MR. JONGENELEN clarified and acknowledged that Mr. Weddleton helped with the TIP criteria, which helps with the MTP.

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

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to approve the 2050 MTP Performance Measures.
ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

e. Response Letter to Anchorage Caucus Members

MR. JONGENELEN presented the response letter from Anchorage Caucus members requesting changes to the TIP.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL noted that the TIP is not approved. We approved it to the point of sending it out for interagency consultation and it will come back before us in August. She thought the letter should be delayed until the TIP is approved because it is not in its final form. She understood the concerns expressed by the Caucus, however, until the Policy Committee takes a position by passing the TIP, this letter is premature.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR was surprised that the Committee has to approve staff responding to someone, since there might be things in this that he did not completely agree with.

MR. JONGENELEN stated that the reason for the draft response is due to the original memorandum being distributed to all the members as the Policy Committee, who then directed staff to draft a response letter for the Committee's review prior to sending it to the Caucus.

ACTING CHAIR VANHOVE opened the floor to public comments.

NANCY PEASE submitted a last-minute letter noting that this raises concerns about the policy role of the Policy Committee and advised that the role of the Committee is very tightly constraining because DOT&PF always had complete control over the design of projects within its corridors since DOT&PF controls more of the funding. Again, she urged the Committee to investigate that question with regard to the mandate to have Continuous, Comprehensive, Cooperative planning. That is the goal. If all those hundreds of millions of dollars of DOT&PFs are not subject at all to the Policy Committee's input, that means the DOT&PF policy is really driving a whole lot of impacts to the system and AMATS is just in a minor response position.

CHERYL RICHARDSON asked if AMATS can establish a process to resolve these issues of Continuing, Cooperative, Comprehensive planning? We are not seeing it, but would like to. What can you do to establish a process to resolve the differences of opinion between Anchorage and the State? The projects referred to in the letter seemed to use the TIP as an example of how AMATS decision-making is done in a black box. The fact that the Eagle River Road was brought forward as an issue of parity so they would get their fair share of the AMATS dollars came out of left field. Other neighborhoods got zero, so it is not clear how that was fair or transparent. Then we have the A and C Streets Complete Streets, which is still a thorn in South Addition's side. We were told that it could not be funded because it had not been modeled yet for its impacts on the system. Now the excuse is that the study was never nominated, per se, or the whole project was nominated. Any project includes a study phase. Again, this was not very transparent and not very honest with the public. The whole issue of the \$200M mile at Scooter and Vanguard is on the table. That is something we really need to wrangle with and not waste that money damaging a low-income neighborhood with an off-ramp and a new collector street to make it easier to get from the Dimond Mall or to Fred Meyers. It seems like a very big sore thumb for AMATS to bear.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to postpone to the September meeting.
ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL explained the rationale for the postponement is that we will have already pushed the TIP out, then we can make any edits to the letter to reflect what actually passes and the members will know how they voted on the TIP at that point because it references specific projects.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

6. PROJECT AND PLAN UPDATES

a. AMATS Transportation Network – Model Presentation

This update was postponed to July 28, 2022.

b. AMATS Website

CHRISTINE SCHUETTE presented the website update.

In response to Assembly Member Dunbar’s comment that no links were available to this meeting’s materials on the event page, MS. SCHUETTE noted that she will create an accessible materials link in that section.

In response to Ms. Pokon’s request for clarification that the link to the Microsoft Teams also provides the phone number associated for those that wish to participate via audio only, MS. SCHUETTE pointed out that the information to join the meeting is also available on the website and instructions on how to participate via telephonically.

ACTING CHAIR VANHOVE asked for public comments.

CHERYL RICHARDSON complimented Ms. Schuette on the work she had done as it made a big difference for those participating online. Ms. Schuette responded to questions promptly and cleaned up problems with the communications, which often make it difficult to hear with microphones being so poor.

7. GENERAL INFORMATION - None

8. COMMITTEE COMMENTS - None

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS

CHERYL RICHARDSON was wondering, if the public and AMATS are able to modify these MTP documents. Is there anything preventing a public work shop with AMATS to go after some of the outcomes the public has been requesting for some time? Is there a way to negotiate some of the language before the criteria are applied to the current nomination list?

MR. JONGENELEN replied that staff will see what can be done.

10. ADJOURNMENT

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

Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 3:19 p.m.