

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

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

**August 25, 2022  
1:30 PM**

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

*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
Brian Lindamood*	Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)
George Donart	
Jeanne Bowie	Kinney Engineering
Luke Bowland*	DOT&PF
Sean Baski	DOT&PF
Noah King	DOT&PF
Cheryl Richardson	
Katy Suddock	
Ben Coleman	R&M Consultants
Bart Rudolph	MOA/Public Transportation Department (PTD)
Adeyemi Alimi*	ADEC
Connor Duff	DNR
Jeff Frkonja	RSG, Inc.
Kathryn Wenger	Federal Highways Administration (FHWA)
Lindsey Hajduk	
Zak Hartman	DOT&PF
Lizzie Newell	
Nicolette Dent	
John Linnell	DOT&PF
Laurie Cummings	HDR, Inc.
Brad Coy*	MOA/Traffic Engineering Department
Jamin Agosti	
Julie Gulombe	
Matt Stichick*	MOA/Anchorage Health Department
Nancy Pease	

John Weddleton

Kevin Cross

MOA/Municipal Assembly

Allie Hartman

Anchorage Assembly Legislative Services Team

Carl Jacobs

Anchorage School District Board

Craig Lyon\*

MOA/Planning Department

Mark Butler

North Star Community Council President

*\*AMATS Technical Advisory Committee Member*

*\*\*Designated Assembly Alternate*

## **1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL**

ACTING CHAIR VANHOVE called the meeting to order at 1:36 p.m. Adam Trombley, Community Development Director represented Mayor Bronson. A quorum was established prior to the arrival of Assembly Member Dunbar at 1:40 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.

## **3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

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

*Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved.*

## **4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – July 28, 2022**

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

*Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.*

## **5. ACTION ITEMS**

### **a. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue – Project Closeout Letter**

MR. JONGENELEN briefed the Committee on the project closeout letter.  
*Assembly Member Dunbar arrived at 1:40 p.m.*

There were no comments.

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

*Hearing no objections, this motion passed.*

**b. 2023-2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Air Quality Conformity Determination**

MR. JONGENELEN noted that the Municipality of Anchorage contains a Limited Maintenance Area for carbon monoxide (CO), in Anchorage, and a Limited Maintenance Area for PM10, in Eagle River. Consequently, federal regulations require that AMATS make an Air Quality Conformity Determination on all transportation plans and programs to assure they will not jeopardize compliance with federal air quality standards for CO and PM10 within the Municipality of Anchorage. These regulations require AMATS to determine that the future emissions from the transportation network envisioned in these plans and programs remain under the allowable emissions budget established in the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality; or in the case of a Limited Maintenance Plan, have a future projected pollutant design value low enough to be reasonably unlikely to exceed a national air quality standard, including projected traffic increases over a 20-year planning horizon.

The Committee discussed having air quality issues since 1996; non-attainment status and process; TIP modifications; and Interagency Consultant Committee requirements.

ACTING CHAIR VANHOVE opened the floor to public comments.

EMILY WEISER with Bike Anchorage understood the frustration that we are almost to the end of the project process and it feels like a lot of work had already gone into this. She did think most of the changes before the Committee today are what the public had asked for repeatedly and are finally being seriously considered, and are prioritizing. It is exciting that AMATS is considering meeting what the community wants. There has also been a lot of changes and, over the course of this year since the last draft of the TIP was released, it has been a really bad year for pedestrian fatalities in Anchorage. We have not gotten to the point where it is usually the worst every year. As it gets darker is when we see it most. It is going to get worse and that is really scary for all of us. We have also seen rising gas prices and more people are thinking about how they can get around without a car, so these non-motorized improvements are for that. Another thing we have seen is a shortage of job-seekers, so there is a lot of talk and impetus in the community for how we can revitalize the city to attract people and retain people, instead of this kind of slow but steady decline that we have been seeing. We know from other cities that non-motorized things are a great way to revitalize and get those people here and get them to stay here. If there is a little bit of a delay as a result of making these changes, she thinks it is worth it, especially because it is a four-year document. A few months is pretty small in the grand scheme of that.

NANCY PEASE noted that they checked in with Cindy Heil (formerly on this board and recently retired from ADEC Air Quality) and read the following quote received from Ms. Heil, "Since Anchorage is a Limited Maintenance Area, our conformity determination is much simpler than most other locations or what we used to have to do prior to 2012. We do not have to model anymore for conformity. All that is required is documentation that the monitors are showing values that meet the criteria, that the plans are fiscally constrained, and that the community is continuing to implement the committed SIP measures." With

that, she thinks, even if some of the projects or changes you might make in your next vote, it does not sound to her as if conformity would be a major undertaking.

MR. ALIMI replied to Ms. Pease that the information she received from Ms. Heil is correct, but the fact remains that the Interagency Consultation Committee needs to see it. The 40 CFR (Code of Federal Regulations) conformity determination is necessary.

ALLIE HARTMAN, Anchorage Assembly Legislative Services Team, echoed her support for the recommendations for changes put forward by the Assembly. She loves to bike around Anchorage and when she moved here five years ago, there was a period well before she was able to ship her car up from the Lower 48 and was biking around town. She is now expecting her first child and this summer she spent some time biking to work and had many close calls with cars. As a young person settling in to Anchorage and raising a family here, she thinks the long-term plan should reflect improvements to multimodal transportation in the city to make it safer for everyone. She echoed what Ms. Weiser had said about it being worthwhile to take some extra time to make sure this plan reflects the direction that we would like to move forward as a community.

JAMIN AGOSTI supports what Ms. Hartman and Ms. Weiser mentioned about taking the time to look at these projects and resolutions passed by the Assembly regarding the TIP. He is strongly in favor of that and thinks we really need to look stronger at promoting multimodal and transit-based projects when looking at these TIP projects. He asked what the process is for taking recommendations approved by the Assembly and folding those into the TIP plan. Is it line-by-line or are there specific project amendments or changes as a result of the Assembly resolutions being considered today?

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to approve the Air Quality Conformity Determination. MR. TROMBLEY seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL appreciated learning more about the determination, when it applies, and some of the ins and outs of the process and procedure today. She thinks it is really helpful. As we discuss the TIP and get public feedback and it comes before the Policy Committee for its final approval, we need to remember that the Air Quality Conformity Determination applies and that while there are certain things that may be brought forward to change the TIP, we need to acknowledge whether or not those are likely exempt projects. Although, she did understand there has to be an additional consultation to determine that exemption. In the past, this determination has stood in the way of being able to make policy decisions or, as an AMATS Policy Committee member, we will always have to go back and redo it. What she learned today is that it is not necessarily redoing it, it is checking in to see if a waiver applies or if we are, otherwise, conforming with the determination, or if we have changed that. She wanted to provide that perspective about how she viewed the Air Quality Conformity Determination based on what we learned here today as we move through our agenda in taking up the TIP.

*Hearing no objections, this motion passed.*

- c. 2023-2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)  
2023-2026 TIP Narrative**

MR. JONGENELEN noted that the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is the AMATS area project plan for transportation improvements. It is the investment program consisting of capital improvements to the metropolitan transportation system. The TIP is the means of implementing the goals and objectives of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Additionally, the TIP process is used to satisfy the public participation process of the Program of Projects (POP) that is required in U.S.C. Section 5307. AMATS administers approximately \$35M in federal transportation funding annually through the Roadway, Non-motorized, Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) Program, and the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) within the urbanized area. The current TIP is approved through 2022.

The Committee discussed local match requirements for STBG (Surface Transportation Block Grant) programs.

ACTING CHAIR VANHOVE opened the floor to public comments.

MATT STICHICK added some clarification on the timing that would be required for changes to the TIP. If it is only exempt projects that are being considered for amendments to the TIP, the conformity is a very straightforward process. It just requires the time to gather together the agency members and have the consultation, and the result would most likely be that the existing approved conformity determination is still valid and needs no further proof. However, he could not say for certain that what could be a holdup is a new public process for the amended TIP and that depends on FHWA's (Federal Highway Administration) transportation planning rules. The air quality consultation group makes the determination on whether the Air Quality Conformity Determination stands. It is possible that, just by amending the TIP, you would have to resubmit it for a new public review, and that is the part he did not know would trigger it. It depends on FHWA's determination of federal transportation planning rules whether it is a substantial change or not.

LIZZIE NEWELL lives in Independence Park, which is the Abbott Loop Community Council area. She is excited to hear about the change with the Scooter/Academy connection that instead of doing a highway underpass, just doing a pedestrian underpass. It really solves a lot of problems. She is on the Abbott Loop Community Council, but was not speaking for them. When we were looking at doing the highway underpass, some other costs were coming up with altering and putting pedestrian sidewalks onto Vanguard and how it would affect traffic on Brigadier Drive and the intersection of Independence and Abbott, which is a very dangerous intersection. She has been nearly struck by a car there twice while walking. Putting in additional automobile traffic coming through Independence Park, she thinks, will make it more dangerous and expensive. Putting in a bike underpass is wonderful and means that people in her neighborhood can walk to the bus station. It is just great and she is really excited about putting in a bike underpass. She would like to encourage you to go that route and she loved how it saves money.

GEORGE DONART was quite concerned about the 92nd Avenue underpass. The other day he was driving down the New Seward Highway and it was only 30 seconds between the Dimond underpass to 92nd and he thought that was not going to save people very much time. It is the largest expenditure next year by far. The only thing that comes close to it is the more areawide maintenance part of the budget. He thinks that the money would be much better spent on other projects around the community, especially pedestrian safety. He

lives on a street that gets a lot of pedestrian traffic and yet our sidewalk only goes for two blocks and then ends. In the wintertime, people have to walk in the street, instead of being able to use the sidewalk. That is just one idea that needs to be looked at before we add additional underpasses where there is already one in a very close proximity.

CARL JACOBS, Anchorage School District Board, is in support of the consideration and review of the TIP in any possible way that can further the goal of providing safe streets for our community, students, parents, and families. We are seeing, due to a transportation staffing shortage, problems that many in our community have known for quite some time and that is Anchorage is built to prioritize vehicle traffic and it is exceptionally difficult to navigate certain areas of town. He lives on the Muldoon curve, which is one of the higher area roads with higher rates of speed that cause numerous and significant accidents. Just recently, he has been keeping up with the AMATS Policy Committee and thanked them for their work and the dual roles each of the committee members share. On behalf of our state and community, his hope is that if there are reasonable and common-sense changes, whether it be looking at the Complete Streets model or facilitating a study as to what can be done to make other modes of transportation more viable and safer, that the TIP should include them as much as possible. Now is the time for that kind of visionary leadership and there is a good group to consider such changes.

CHERYL RICHARDSON thanked folks for taking all of this very seriously and the Assembly for their move to codify a number of changes the public has been asking for decades. We have an old random polling survey from the Anchorage Citizens Coalition. An expensive poll of voters only and they said they would much rather invest in improved transit than road expansion. This is old polling. God knows what it would look like today. You hear the support everywhere for safe walking and biking. Some day we will put Transit on the table, noticing that Transit is still not a player at this table. She is concerned that the conformity analysis is being raised as a reason not to make changes at this date, which seems like a boogie-man in a closet that is raised when needed. When we look at the law, we do not see where any of the changes recommended by the Assembly would require any further in-depth analysis or trigger problems. In terms of requiring further public participation, the federal code requirement is triggered only if the final plan differs significantly from the version that was made available for public comment and raises new material issues that interested parties could not have foreseen from the public involvement efforts. Let us keep moving here and not raise the specter of unreasonable extensions of timelines as a reason not to take action on this excellent Assembly resolution.

JOHN WEDDLETON noted that the Assembly nearly unanimously passed this resolution recommending changes to the TIP. The items on this are not new, but are things we have heard for years from the public. Particularly now is the Vanguard/Scooter connection and, that is something 20 years ago when this project was being scoped and started being planned, there was huge congestion at Seward Highway and Dimond and Abbott, especially around Christmas. It was such a gridlock and looked like this project was needed. Since then, there have been substantial changes that have made it no longer needed. The building at Tikahtnu Mall drew a huge amount of traffic out of the Dimond Center. He has a business in there and is fully aware that the number of people shopping in that mall has plummeted. We also have the growth of the Abbott Town Center that has a huge number of services that were not there 20 years ago, 15 years ago, and 10 years ago. He lived nearby and could get everything he needed done in that town center without having to cross the highway. We also have the plan to do the Diverging Diamond at O'Malley, which can have

50% or 100% more traffic through that intersection and makes it less necessary to do this, and should take pressure off of the Dimond/Abbott/Seward Highway Interchange. We really do not need this. What we are hearing is that we are locked in to it because we planned it. If we change it, we have to go through all these hoops and delay everything. It is very frustrating. There is so much money. It is money to build a tunnel and the tunnel should be there for pedestrians. Anyone at DOT&PF knows we need that because they reenforced the gate to keep people from running across year after year. The pedestrians think it is absolutely needed. For cars, it has diminished substantially. You could save the money on the roundabouts on the city's project with \$12 to \$16M. That is like half of what we get in a year for AMATS funds to spend on that and it just is not needed. The project is not needed and we should have a mechanism to right size our project and go forward, and not spend money on things we do not need anymore. We have already done things to alleviate the traffic. To say it will have to go back to public comment, you have public comments and have already responded to public comments. Do what the public asks. You having to go back to them again has been constantly stated in this process and simply makes no sense. He recommended these TIP changes be passed. It can go back to the Air Quality Conformity Interagency Committee and we will find out how long that takes. He cannot imagine it is that long and we can then move forward with this. It just does not make sense to be locked in to huge, expensive projects we no longer need just because that is what we have been doing.

NANCY PEASE spoke to several of the projects the Assembly is endorsing. First is the study of best policies and practices for greenhouse gas reductions from transportation sources. This will develop a toolkit for AMATS. AMATS' staff has no expertise in this area and no time to develop it. AMATS' staff promised to pursue this after deferring this issue during the MTP 2040 comment period. They have not pursued it. They tell us they do not have the time. Second, expand the title of the recreational trails plan update to include utilitarian trails. The State agency should have no qualms about this, this is a local issue. AMATS still needs to identify a complete network of pedestrian routes. The non-motorized plan of 2019, that AMATS produced, did not provide complete neighborhood level connections for everyday commuting to school, the store, and between neighborhoods. Expanding the title and purpose of this plan will not significantly change the workload for AMATS, but will improve the connectivity and the funding sources for local commuter trails. Third, expanding this title to a non-motorized facility inventory to include undeveloped existing pedestrian easements and rights-of-way. This is a common-sense approach to taking full stock of all the options we have for local connectivity. There is a hidden network of existing platted easements, not new but existing, that show up under various layers of municipal mapping, but they need to be collected and mapped in one place so that they can be a planning tool. They are an untapped resource. Finally, the case of the 92nd Avenue underpass and the associated collector roads is similar to the Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard project that you just cancelled. In both cases, the considerable impact outweighs the benefits. You have a choice here to avoid expanding vehicular capacity in a location where capacity is not needed. You have a choice to build a direct non-motorized corridor that will be faster, safer, and much more attractive than driving. Deleting the underpass will reduce future emissions and allow infill of the neighborhood commercial center at Abbott, in accordance with our land use plans. It will avoid impacts to low-income neighborhoods and the outdoor recreation area. With this project, if it were built, you would put 10,000 vehicles a day cutting through low-income neighborhoods and taking two sides of the children's sports fields. You have a choice of conscience and professionalism to vote for the freeway interchange and taking sides with engineers from 25 years ago, to build out

their vision of more highway lanes converging on the Dimond Center, which is no longer the beating heart of Anchorage retail. Or you can take the side of the citizens, especially children and young people, and build a pedestrian bike underpass and show your commitment to the future.

MARK BUTLER, North Star Community Council Vice President. As a former DOT&PF person, he noted there is a typographical error under the Anchorage Cargo Cold Storage that is referred to as Ted Stevens International Airport, there is no such place. It is Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport. The substantial comments are about Fireweed Lane and it is our number one project that we are interested in having focused on by the TIP. In our community council, it is number one. We are interested in that. He noticed there is no money for Fireweed. There is \$44M after 2026, so that project is pushed way back. He is hoping that, perhaps next year or sooner, it will be pushed up to construction dollars, and the same with the rest of the construction dollars for the Spenard Road Rehabilitation, which is close to final design. We are eager for those two projects to go ahead. If that means taking an unused suburban road project or an under needed project and put it into definite high-value roads like these, we would be all in favor of that at North Star Community Council.

There were no further comments.

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

### **Amendment #1**

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to amend to delete the current project (NHS0004) that contains the construction of the vehicular underpass at 92nd Avenue/Scooter Avenue as part of this State Transportation Improvement Plan. ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL noted that, as we have heard from the public, we think that this project really creates, first and foremost, a problem for the neighborhood. The cars to pass through and really a vehicular response to a non-motorized issue or pedestrian issue that is trying to be solved really seems to be too much. And, really, the too much is expressed in the need for the follow along project, the Academy/Vanguard project. There has been considerable concern for the neighborhood and, she thinks, it has gained communitywide traction. If this project were to go forward, one of the main concerns is that the projects are not in any kind of alignment, but cars will go in to this neighborhood years before the Academy/Vanguard project is completed. Mr. Dunbar and she, with Assembly Member Volland, took the incredible step of asking the full Assembly to weigh-in on this TIP. We have heard community transportation goals and objectives and desires, and one of the ways that we effectuate those is through the TIP. So, this resolution, 2022-254(S), passed 11 to 1 through the Assembly and this amendment was part of that. The conversation had really been about how can we right size this project? We understand that there have been dollars expended to get this project ready to go, so we are not intending to just leave it as deleted; we would actually want to add it back in with a non-motorized underpass so the monies spent on this project have not gone to waste. It just right sizes it. In doing so and not needing the Academy/Vanguard project, we are responsive to the public



and we also free up money in the TIP that is currently slated for Academy/Vanguard and can deal with some other priorities of the community.

In response to Mr. Trombley's question regarding the amendments, ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL explained that she will propose three separate amendments. If this amendment passes, the follow along amendment would be to add a new project that mirrors that project, noting that it is a non-vehicular freeway crossing. The last follow along amendment would be to remove Academy/Vanguard.

MR. TROMBLEY asked staff for clarification that if we vote yes on one and then subsequently yes, are we changing the definition of the project? Can we do that?

MR. JONGENELEN replied, yes, as it is written here, what this is trying to do is change the description of the project to what it will do. Instead of having a vehicular underpass, it is a non-motorized underpass. This appears to be trying to go around the limitations the Policy Committee has where it cannot edit descriptions of projects that are not AMATS funded. As we talked about at a previous meeting when this came forward for the Interagency Consultation, AMATS' Policy Committee has three options when it comes to adding projects to the TIP, outside of AMATS' allocation. The first is accepting the project as is. Second is not accepting it or deleting it entirely. Third is sending a letter, a resolution, a memorandum, or something to the main sponsor of the project letting them know of the concerns, and asking them to adjust the description of the project. This third item is something AMATS cannot do unless it is asking AMATS to add it in as a project that will be AMATS funded. The AMATS Policy Committee does not have the authority to tell DOT&PF what to do with their federal funding, just as DOT&PF does not have the authority to tell AMATS what to do with its federal funding.

MR. TROMBLEY referred to the first amendment where it says to delete the current project. Instead of removing it, could we send these to the AMATS Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)? Have they seen this?

MR. JONGENELEN stated that this resolution has not officially gone before the TAC. And, yes, the Policy Committee can send it to them, but it would have to be after this meeting.

MR. TROMBLEY explained that a lot of times we do not have the technical expertise. We rely on the TAC and then we make our policy decisions based on that information. If we are getting a new project and do not have the technical expertise to understand that project, we have that committee for a reason, so he is wondering if the Policy Committee could send this in some capacity? Do we have the ability to send it to them to review and give us what they think, as they look at it holistically with all the different groups that are better on the TAC? Could we send this amendment to the TAC asking them what it would mean to delete the vehicular underpass at 92nd Avenue/Scooter?

MR. JONGENELEN noted that, yes, but the problem is that it would delay approval of the TIP creating significant issues. The TIP needs to be approved today to stay on schedule.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL called a Point of Order. She thinks staff is providing a lot of commentary that is not in direct response to the questions. We have talked about the procedure, but these are policy decisions and she is having some problems today with AMATS staff's opinions about this.

MR. TROMBLEY expressed that if it is not staff's opinion and there is no conjecture, he was wondering about the AMATS process. Can we add these projects in or take them out as we want? Is it a public process? Can we take them out and move new ones in that have not been reviewed by the TAC? It sounds like we are already changing the project description, which staff had said that, legally, we cannot change.

MR. JONGENELEN noted that, for these types of projects outside of AMATS' allocation, we cannot. It is part of the 3C (Continuing, Cooperative, and Comprehensive) process. FHWA would have to weigh in and he had already asked them if the AMATS Policy Committee can make that change. Their response was that, as part of the 3C process, you work with DOT&PF to develop these descriptions to be included in the TIP.

MR. TROMBLEY commented that you hear from the public and he understood that, over time, projects change. If the project is valid (he is sympathetic to a project being valid or being changed), is it possible to put it in the TIP and, at a later date, send something like this to the TAC? As we vote on the TIP, could something be taken out of the new TIP in the following years? Or once it is in there, is that it?

MR. JONGENELEN replied that it can be taken out. This Committee can send it to the TAC for their review and provide a recommendation for a later time.

*The Committee recessed at 2:33 p.m.*

*The Committee reconvened at 2:44 p.m.*

MR. TROMBLEY asked Assembly Member Zaletel if she would be open to a motion sending the entire resolution #3 to the TAC.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL thinks it is a really great idea, however, this is in the STIP and, right now, is a 2023 under construction project and \$105M is slated to go as soon as 2023. She believed 2023 starts October 1 of this year for the State. She is not sure we have the time for that because the project could kick off as soon as October 1.

MR. TROMBLEY asked what the project kick off would look like because he had a hard time believing they are going to start with bulldozers in October. Is there a NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) process?

SEAN BASKI with DOT&PF informed the Committee that, as far as the current schedule for the Seward Highway/O'Malley to Dimond project, the outlook is for certification. Development of all the plans, utility agreements, completion of all the right-of-way (ROW) acquisitions (which are nearly 99.9% complete on all the ROW acquisitions) look to be done somewhere around April of next year and be ready to certify it. No on-ground construction is expected until later in the summer of 2023.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL asked if the right-of-way acquisition would be significantly impacted or changed if the type of underpass was changed?

MR. BASKI noted that it would depend upon a number of different things. Right now, the highway is slated to go over and the existing topography to the west and to the east are not

at the same height. We would certainly have to use a lot of the right-of-way that we already acquired from the soccer fields and from the private property there. We would unlikely need additional right-of-way, but we would probably need a lot of what we have already acquired.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL altered her response to Mr. Trombley, slightly, that she is not necessarily opposed to what Mr. Trombley is suggesting, if we could time limit it. We could always make an amendment to the TIP. If we time limit it so that we were done with that review in this position and maybe make a more informed decision before the end of the year, she could possibly agree to that. That seems to be, possibly, the middle ground here.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR expressed to staff that his concern is that there are several amendments that the Assembly passed that require funding and we are fiscally constrained. He asked what the impact would be of Mr. Trombley's suggestion keeping that project in there and talking to the State about changing it? If that is the case, then it seems we have not freed up the money for the other amendments. Is that a fair interpretation?

MR. JONGENELEN replied that deleting the project does not free up money for AMATS to use. It is a State funded project and is DOT&PF's federal funding.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR asked if the rest of the amendments, regardless of what Mr. Jongenelen feels are useful or not, are not contingent upon what we do here?

MR. JONGENELEN clarified for this one project, no, they are not.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR asked what the impact would be rather than leaving this project in there in this form and asking the State to change it? Would the impact be deleting it now and then go to the State asking if they would like to put it back in as an altered version of this project?

MR. JONGENELEN noted that it would be up to the State to respond to the impacts.

ACTING CHAIR VANHOVE explained that the major issue the State has right now, if you delete the project in its entirety, is that we are currently under a new process where we develop criteria similar to the MTP (Metropolitan Transportation Plan) and score and rank projects based on the category of projects in which they are. We have not even developed a criteria yet for what we consider expansion or modernization projects, which this project would fall under one of those two categories. Number one, the only project criteria we have is for repair, which is basically pavement rehabilitation. We are months away from developing a criteria before it would even be considered as a project. Number two, the State would have to then provide a replacement project if we deemed it a reasonable replacement project and then take it to the State for an opportunity to score it. Then we would have to rely upon whether or not there is funding. With the latest Governor's initiative that we support, they just dropped approximately \$1B into the fiscal plan. We get \$650M per year and on top of our program that we currently have, we are in the outer years before considering any additional new projects let alone developing criteria to even accept criteria to score additional new projects.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR asked how did this project get in here if you do not have criteria for scoring projects?

ACTING CHAIR VANHOVE replied that it had been around for 20 years, but this whole concept about developing criteria is brand new. There was a different process prior to this.

MR. TROMBLEY referred to Assembly Member Zaletel's statement about a timeline, and asked if can we put a timeline to get an answer back to us before the end of the year? Is it possible to send this to the TAC and get an answer before the end of the year?

MR. JONGENELEN noted, yes, we can make it available at the next TAC meeting and have an answer by the next Policy Committee meeting.

In response to Assembly Member Dunbar's question as to the impact delaying the TIP until our next meeting to hear that answer before we pass the TIP, MR. JONGENELEN explained that there are a lot of impacts because, if we do not approve the TIP until next month or later, it delays when FHWA and FTA can approve the TIP. For example, if we wait until next month to approve the TIP, then FHWA and FTA will not have the opportunity to approve the Air Quality Conformity Determination until sometime in October. We will have missed our deadline since it has to be done before the end of the fiscal year because our current TIP ends at the end of FY2022. That impacts any project starts. Projects cannot start until the TIP air quality is approved. New phases cannot start and that could lead to a compounding effect that happens where this phase was not started, so the next phase is late starting, or money is lost because we were not able to obligate it in time. Additionally, this is a reminder that our last certification review had a corrective action on it because we missed the deadline for our MTP. FHWA wants to ensure we are making steps to getting our plans approved on time, not just by the Policy Committee but also by FHWA.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL stated that she wanted to keep the amendment on the table. If there is a subsequent amendment, should her amendment fail, she would consider it for the bracketing of the timing. She heard the feedback that this feels like it is trying to make a line-item change. She thinks it is more than a line-item change and it substantially alters the type of project having a non-motorized underpass versus a vehicular underpass. Those are two separate and distinct types of projects. She does think there is some utility in using what has occurred for 92nd Avenue and Scooter in doing what she believed to be a replacement project. At this point, if the advice from staff is that the way she has the amendment set up in the resolution would not be allowed, then she will not bring the replacement project amendment and just simply move to delete this one, and that will be that. That is where she is at with it, so she would like to go ahead and vote on this amendment, as presented.

ACTING CHAIR VANHOVE restated that the amendment is to delete the underpass and the project on 92nd Avenue. He called for a vote.

Amendment #1

YAY

Assembly Member Zaletel  
Assembly Member Dunbar

NAY

Mr. Trombley  
Ms. Pokon  
Acting Chair Vanhove

***The amendment failed 2 to 3.***

In response to Assembly Member Zaletel's request for clarification regarding the AMATS Interim 2050 MTP update and what the funding of \$400,000 is for, MR. JONGENELEN explained that it is to start the next MTP update because that will have to start as soon as the current one is done.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL asked if there is, typically, other funding? Other than the one-time funding to work on the MTP?

MR. JONGENELEN replied that the reason CRRSAA funding is shown is because CRRSAA is non-match. For the 2050 MTP, it took staff about 6 or 7 months to get the match in place and caused a delay. This effort was to try and eliminate the match.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL asked if that match comes from the MOA or other funding sources?

MR. JONGENELEN noted that it is a split match of half MOA and half DOT&PF. The delay was due to DOT&PF not wanting to pay for it.

### Amendment #2

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to amend to delete the AMATS Interim 2050 MTP Update from Table 4 (Plans and Studies) in the TIP. ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL referred to Table 4 (Plans & Studies), AMATS Interim 2050 MTP Update stating that she did not want to delete the entire thing. She wanted to delete the CRRSAA funding at 400, or does it mean the whole thing goes because the other ones estimated funding in the future. She requested to remove the project.

ACTING CHAIR VANHOVE restated that the amendment is to remove the AMATS Interim 2050 MTP Update.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL noted that the municipal match would be \$200,000 and looking at the budget forecast for the municipality for \$200,000 can definitely be picked up through a different funding source than CRRSAA funding. This CRRSAA funding is really a unique opportunity and, she thinks, what is really important to her in our other amendments is the AC Corridor study. \$400,000 is enough to at least get going on that. The other corridor studies are about \$700,000. It feels like the AC Corridor studies are the ones missing to complete the package on the corridor studies. Her intention would be to move to add the A and C Corridor studies using this one source.

MR. TROMBLEY asked staff what deleting this will do? Does it have collateral damage somewhere else or is it fine?

MR. JONGENELEN replied that the MTP update is federally required for us to update every four years, so that is what this is doing in here. Historically, it has been funded out of the TIP. If there are other funding sources available for it, that would be nice, but in the

past that had not materialized and this is a critical project that we must do every four years.

MR. TROMBLEY clarified that we usually get the funding from the TIP, so why can we not do the STBG funding now? If we use the TIP funding, it requires a match?

MR. JONGENELEN explained that it was because there was CRRSA available. With the impacts last time that the match had on delaying that project and causing us to basically do everything last minute, we thought it would be easier to have no match required and get that project moving faster. TIP funding does require a 9.03% match. The current MTP was about \$800,000, so it would be 9.03% of that \$800,000. That amount was split between the MOA and DOT&PF, which was about \$40,000 each.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL pointed out that for the MOA side at the last Budget and Finance Committee meeting, we saw that vehicular rental tax is well above expectations in addition to our portion of room taxes. We are just really doing well fiscally from the MOA versus the projections. Finding this amount of money moving into the end of the year, which was actually for 2024 spending. Moving into 2024 should not be a problem to commit for the MOA. I believe we came up with the calculation of about \$40,000, so definitely doable.

MR. TROMBLEY would be likely to support it if we were able to somehow put on the record that the funding was going to come from another location, so that it was at least a part of the amendment that the funding was going to come from the vehicle tax or something. Before we just remove it, we need to identify a funding source since this is required.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL noted that the best we can do is say that we will attempt to add it to the budget in 2023, so that it goes to AMATS. As you know with the Assembly, we are only two representatives here on this Body, and it will have to go through the 12-member Body. It would also be something that a department can bring forward as part of its budget in and for the MOA. Particularly the department and the departments that are around planning or a part of AMATS. AMATS is separate but is contained within certain portions of the infrastructure of the MOA.

MR. TROMBLEY mentioned that, as you are well aware, budgets can become highly political. His concern is the guarantee.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL stated that she knows it is not until 2024.

MR. TROMBLEY commented that that makes it less of a guarantee. He would hate to be in a position where we do not have the match. If we could identify and put it in there then it would be more reliable.

MR. JONGENELEN clarified that the \$40,000 would be matched to federal funding, so you would still have to identify the federal funding in the TIP and show it in here. If you remove the project entirely, there is no project in the TIP and there is no federal funding for that match to be used for.

MR. TROMBLEY added that, unless federally required to do that project, we cannot delete it. Well, we can but then we will not do it and be dinged in some capacity by the federal government.

MR. JONGENELEN stated, yes, that is correct if you do not have an approved MTP and you do not have transportation projects. The MTP is one of the core projects just like the TIP that we have to do.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL mentioned that we can always amend the TIP if we free up other money in the TIP to use the STBG funds, but we have not freed any money up for that purpose yet. Right now, we are fully, fiscally constrained on that amount of funding. One of the places that could be freed up would be Academy/Vanguard. She thinks that likely might be coming. As projects fall off the TIP (as happens from time-to-time) that could also free up the funding for this purpose. There is still \$1M in estimated need for the MTP after 2026. This is a small piece of the overall project.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR noted that to put a firmer number on it, we have \$9M of additional rental car tax, which will hopefully cover the costs and would be a drop in the bucket compared to that.

ACTING CHAIR VANHOVE restated that the amendment is to remove the Interim 2050 MTP 400K CRRSAA money. He then called for a vote.

Amendment #2

YAY

Assembly Member Zaletel

Assembly Member Dunbar

NAY

Mr. Trombley

Ms. Pokon

Acting Chair Vanhove

***The amendment failed 2 to 3.***

Amendment #3

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to amend the non-motorized facilities inventory mapping project (PLN00019) to include an inventory of the non-motorized easements, pedestrian rights-of-way, and undeveloped rights-of-way in addition to non-motorized facilities within the AMATS area. ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL noted that we talked about this at the work session and we understand that adding this would be work. It is her understanding, as well, there is an MOA existing GIS that could be utilized for this purpose to add it to the plan. The idea here is to collect all this information in one place and, we believe, AMATS is best suited as it is a little bit arms-length from how those rights-of-way easements and pedestrian rights-of-way, and undeveloped rights-of-way, and non-motorized easements may be utilized, and the policy around them, which will likely be controlled by the MOA.

MR. TROMBLEY asked if the TAC had seen this?

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL replied, no, this resolution being brought forward did not go to the TAC. It is a change to an existing project.

MR. TROMBLEY asked for clarification if there is a precedent for changing the description of a project without going through the TAC?

MR. JONGENELEN explained, yes, this is a doable act by this Committee **and is on an exempt project**, so there are no air quality conformity concerns, in that regard.

MR. TROMBLEY asked for further clarification that there is no challenge with this and it does not bind us in any capacity?

MR. JONGENELEN stated that, from his standpoint, as the Coordinator, he did not see an issue with this change.

MR. TROMBLEY asked Assembly Member Zaletel her reasoning why she wants to expand because, right now, it says the project would inventory the non-motorized facilities and you are expanding it to pedestrian right-of-way and non-motorized easements.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL explained that there are a number of rights-of-way and easements that are not traditionally captured in our non-motorized plan that can ensure connectivity amongst neighborhoods. A lot of them are unknown and often not known (she learned this from Assembly Member Cross at the work session) until an as-built survey is done. We do have a GIS layer within the MOA, so it would be nice to inventory them and then we would be able to have discussions particularly around district plans utilizing the non-motorized plan to see what connectivity those neighborhoods may want to establish within their neighborhoods.

ACTING CHAIR VANHOVE called for a vote.

Amendment #3

YAY

Assembly Member Zaletel  
Assembly Member Dunbar  
Mr. Trombley  
Ms. Pokon

NAY

***The amendment passed 4 to 0.***

Amendment #4

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to amend to add a 5th and 6th Avenue signalization project listed in the 4th year of the TIP. MR. TROMBLEY seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL noted that we talked about this before and did not get clarification on whether or not a fourth-year project could be added to the TIP. The idea here is that this prioritizes this project should something fall off the TIP. She thinks, given recent events, that safety around signalization and lighting is really important particularly for this corridor. While we do not have existing funding because we are fiscally constrained,



stating that this is a priority should funding become available, is the right policy call to make.

MR. TROMBLEY asked if this project had been scored in the past and why was it removed?

MR. JONGENELEN replied, yes, it was scored and was originally removed due to funding limitations and constraint concerns that it was going to cost more than we had available at the time.

MR. TROMBLEY further asked that since it was scored and removed, does it need to go back to be scored again or does that scoring sustain in perpetuity?

MR. JONGENELEN replied it is sustained, so it would need to be rescored again.

MR. TROMBLEY asked if we know the cost of this?

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL noted that we have some comparative projects: 3rd Avenue is listed on the roadway table as is East 4th Avenue signal and lighting upgrade. She apologized but her amendment should have said 5th and 6th signal and lighting upgrade just for conformity. Some are in the \$5M range (for the one) and the other is in the \$10M range, but it is broken up and phased.

MR. TROMBLEY clarified with Assembly Member Zaletel that since it is in the fourth year that means we are fiscally constrained to the project and we have identified a funding source. Is that kind of your wish list?

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL replied that it is like a wish list, but it is a really, really high priority because it did fall off.

MR. JONGENELEN clarified that the fourth year of the TIP is actually a fiscally constrained year, so you would need to identify a funding source. It would be beyond the fourth year if you want to and it would be an illustrative list of projects that the Committee could recommend and say, "This is our next priority, if funding comes available."

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL revised her amendment to add a 5th and 6th Avenue signalization and lighting project listed in the fifth year of the TIP. MR. TROMBLEY seconded.

ACTING CHAIR VANHOVE called for a vote on the amendment to add a 5th and 6th Avenue signal and lighting project to the fifth year of the TIP.

Amendment #4

YAY

Assembly Member Zaletel  
Assembly Member Dunbar  
Mr. Trombley  
Ms. Pokon

NAY

***The amendment passed 4 to 0.***

**Amendment #5**

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to amend the Fireweed Lane Rehabilitation project description to read, "...changing Fireweed from 4 lanes to a maximum of 3 lanes...".  
MR. TROMBLEY seconded.

MR. TROMBLEY noted that this does make sense and asked if we are changing a project description?

MR. JONGENELEN clarified that it is a project description change and there would not be a problem making this change. He was already intending on bringing this forward as an amendment to the TIP at a later date.

In response to Mr. Trombley's question if this financially changes what is in the line item, MR. JONGENELEN stated, no, it does not change it financially. What this does is give more flexibility for the project to be able to look at other options besides just the three lanes. For example, maybe the center turn lane is not needed.

ACTING CHAIR VANHOVE restated that the amendment is changing the project description of the Fireweed project from 4 lanes to a maximum of 3 lanes. He called for a vote.

**Amendment #5**

YAY

Assembly Member Zaletel  
Assembly Member Dunbar  
Mr. Trombley  
Ms. Pokon

NAY

***The amendment passed 4 to 0.***

**Amendment #6**

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to amend to add a project that says, "Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Plan" and the description would be that it is a databased plan that directly targets current and future Anchorage greenhouse gas emissions and quantitatively evaluates strategies and actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions within AMATS.  
ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL asked staff if she has to have funding for this?

MR. JONGENELEN explained that she could put it in the fifth year. If additional funding becomes available soon, it could be moved in. Just a heads up that, as part of the future amendment, he was looking to make a recommendation that is a little more encompassing than this to do a climate action plan for Anchorage that would incorporate these things, as well as add a resiliency piece to it because one of the things we have been working on is incorporating resiliency more into our planning process.

In response to Assembly Member Dunbar's question if putting this amendment in the fifth year hampers our efforts, MR. JONGENELEN stated no.

MR. TROMBLEY requested help understanding the correlation between this in the "whereas" section of the amendment of the Anchorage Climate Action Plan. Is that on top of the Anchorage Climate Action Plan or does that substitute for it?

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL explained that the Climate Action Plan sets targets but it does not actually set ways to go about doing it or measuring it. The Climate Action Plan is a policy document that does not necessarily have the tools and pieces to determine if we are meeting those policy goals.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL has an alternate route to get to where she thinks we want to go. If okay, it would be working with Mr. Jongenelen on coming up with a comprehensive TIP amendment where we also involve the Climate Action Plan Coordinator, Shaina Kilcoyne, to come up with something, cost it, and work through how we can look at doing a TIP amendment. She understood there is always a lot going on but trying to prioritize that in the next 60 to 90 days and seeing what funding may or may not come available. She really wants that work to coincide, should there be an additional amendment from Mr. Trombley (she did not know if there would be) to refer that DOT&PF project on to the TAC.

MR. JONGENELEN noted that his plan was to start an amendment as soon as this TIP was approved.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL added that it looks like our timing would align.

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

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL noted that the Committee can look forward to another amendment at a later date in coordination with staff.

MR. TROMBLEY expressed that he had heard from the community the desire to have that pedestrian connectivity with 92nd Avenue/Vanguard. He was assuming that when that is built, there will be pedestrian facilities. Will the road, itself, have bike lanes and will there be a pedestrian-friendly component to it? Or will it just be a road? He is also assuming there will be sidewalks.

LUKE BOWLAND with DOT&PF replied that the plan is to have bike and pedestrian improvements. He did not know to what extent on the 92nd Avenue extension, but one of the things he had been listening to and following is the action plan by the Assembly. The discussion here is to pull together that information and to pull together the justification for both the pedestrian and vehicle improvements for that part of the project.

MR. TROMBLEY asked Mr. Bowland for clarification that, when going through that design process, DOT&PF will talk to community councils and the Assembly about how those pedestrian facilities look, and how that flows?

MR. BOWLAND explained that, as Mr. Baski stated earlier, a lot of that has already been done to date. The utility agreements are wrapping up right away and we are proceeding with the final design on this. We have done a fair amount of public outreach and, as part of our NEPA process, we are required to look at multimodal and all forms of transportation.

MR. TROMBLEY asked if it was too late for someone to get involved, like the Policy Committee, to say (hypothetically speaking) we would like not just sidewalks but we also would like a pedestrian overpass. Is it too late for that?

MR. BOWLAND replied that it would be a change in design at this point. It would be a massive one, but discussing that with DOT&PF would be a better avenue than what we are discussing here today in trying to make small changes to a DOT&PF project that is included in the TIP because it is federally funded within the area. More discussion would be warranted on this.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR expressed that he is still confused as to where we ended up with that project. That is to say, we did not delete it and he did not think we actually amended the language at all. What exactly is going to happen on that project after this? Mr. Trombley had indicated a desire to see it go back to the TAC for them to evaluate making it a pedestrian-only facility. Can we still amend and delete this project at a later date?

MR. JONGENELEN replied, yes, it can be deleted at a later date.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR asked that if the State agrees, the State can come to us and we could work together to change the scope of the project? Is that right?

MR. JONGENELEN noted that basically for these types of projects you get it changed in the STIP and then it translates down into the TIP and adjusts whatever the description is in the STIP.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR asked if we vote on this TIP today, what is the next step that will happen on this project?

MR. BOWLAND reinforced the Committee that this project is proceeding with final right-of-way actions and most of that he had already addressed at this point, which are finalizing the utility agreements for impacts related to the project and finalizing the design. As Mr. Baski previously stated, we will be looking at obligating funds in the April timeframe. There is time between now and then to have further discussions on this.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR asked if we could direct the TAC to take something like this up? He thought that our intent was to leave this project in, but we want the TAC to look at making the changes that parts of the community have expressed and desired. Can we do that? What authority does the Policy Committee have to direct the TAC?

MR. JONGENELEN replied that an amendment could be made to today saying, "Please send this back to the TAC for consideration of a future amendment to the TIP deleting this project or working with DOT&PF to get a project description change in the STIP", or something like that.

**Amendment #7**

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR so moved. ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL seconded.

MR. JONGENELEN added that we could then work with the TAC to reach out to DOT&PF based on the comments this Committee brought forward today that says there have been concerns expressed on this project and we need to sit down and discuss and see what can be done.

MR. TROMBLEY asked, from a process standpoint, if we approve the TIP and make an amendment to send the project to the TAC, that it will not delay the TIP? That way the TAC can then work with DOT&PF asking how we can adjust this to make it pedestrian-friendly and ensure that it is pedestrian-friendly, as well as whatever they come up with. But we are at the point now that if it was to become pedestrian only, DOT&PF would have to agree to change it in the STIP. If they do not agree to change it in the STIP, then it is what it is, but we could still be involved in the design aspect of it as far as making a pedestrian overpass or put in bike lanes, or whatever the case is.

MR. JONGENELEN replied that according to the 3C process, yes.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR noted that he made a motion for an amendment and Assembly Member Zaletel seconded it. He wanted to double check with staff that they know where it goes and what it looks like.

MR. JONGENELEN believed he understood that it is to take the Seward Highway project (NHS0004) to the Technical Advisory Committee and discuss with them what has been discussed here today about working with DOT&PF to change the project (92nd Avenue underpass portion) to see if it could be made more pedestrian-friendly either through changing it to a non-motorized facility only, or adding a pedestrian overpass, or something else to that effect. If you have specific language you want him to use, he will need to have it outlined.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL restated for Assembly Member Dunbar that the language would be to “evaluate the feasibility and impacts of only including a non-motorized underpass at 92nd and Scooter and getting rid of the vehicular underpass”. She thinks that is the technical advice and is looking to see what that does, and if we can time constrain that to recommendations no later than the November Policy Committee meeting.

MR. JONGENELEN stated that it would depend how much effort DOT&PF would need. He would bring this to the next TAC meeting in September to let them know, but then we have to work with DOT&PF, and he did not know how much time they needed to make the evaluation.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL meant for the TAC update to be no later than the PC meeting in November. Wherever it is at and if they are still working on it. But because we have the April timeline in 2023 it is important to keep getting updates about it and put some timelines on that process.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR asked, for his knowledge and for the public, if the public is able to participate in the TAC meetings the way they are at the PC meetings?

MR. JONGENELEN replied, yes, as long as it is an action item. He would put this forward as an action item based on this Committee's recommendations and the public will be given opportunities to provide their testimony, just like today.

MR. TROMBLEY moved to extend the meeting 15 minutes. ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR seconded.

***Hearing no objections, this motion passed.***

MR. TROMBLEY asked Mr. Bowland if moving it there delays the project timewise? Does it make you stop doing what you are currently doing?

MR. BOWLAND noted that what he is hearing right now is that we are looking at an update to the resolution from the Assembly in which we would like to pull together the information we have in terms of justification for both vehicular and pedestrian/bike improvements for 92nd Avenue, and have that discussion. Depending on the direction of those discussions, the project may proceed and be obligated in April as planned. If there are scope changes like switching the scope of the project to a pedestrian-only crossing there under New Seward, then that would be a delay to the project schedule.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR asked if DOT&PF had ever converted a motorized project to a non-vehicular project?

ACTING CHAIR VANHOVE stated not to his knowledge.

MR. BOWLAND replied, no, not to his knowledge. In this situation, we could still retain the highway improvements along New Seward, so it would be a change to a portion of the project.

MR. JONGENELEN restated that the amendment is to send the Seward Highway (NHS 0004) project to evaluate the feasibility impacts of only including a non-motorized underpass at 92nd Avenue and Scooter and not have a vehicular underpass.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL confirmed by stating, yes.

MR. JONGENELEN added to then have TAC update by November where they are at in the process.

MR. TROMBLEY added with the understanding that regardless of when they come back that if the State does not want to take it out of their STIP, then it is what it is, right?

ACTING CHAIR VANHOVE called for a vote on Amendment #7 as restated by Mr. Jongenelen.

YAY

Assembly Member Zaletel  
Assembly Member Dunbar  
Mr. Trombley  
Ms. Pokon

NAY

***The amendment passed 4 to 0.***

MR. TROMBLEY clarified that the Anchorage International Airport was mentioned during discussion. Should we amend it?

MR. JONGENELEN noted that it was a technical error and can just be corrected.

ACTING CHAIR VANHOVE called for a vote on the main motion, as amended.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL expressed that she had been happy with the amendments that did move today. She thinks this illustrates a couple of things: 1) is Anchorage really needs to find a way to develop a long-range transportation plan for itself that can be a plan that is really considered in the overall planning of these projects. She thinks, right now, we are running into this bit of a chicken and egg problem because a lot of the TIP effectuates what is in the MTP. And the MTP, frankly, is Anchorage's only long-range transportation plan at the moment. She did not believe it reflects community priorities in the way we are hearing about them, so there is nothing we can do about that in AMATS, but she thinks that would possibly relieve some of the tension between doing this TIP process and kind of what we are hearing as policy-makers for the municipality.

***MAIN MOTION, AS AMENDED***

YAY

Assembly Member Dunbar  
Mr. Trombley  
Ms. Pokon

NAY

Assembly Member Zaletel

***The motion passed 3 to 0, as amended.***

## **6. PROJECT AND PLAN UPDATES**

### **a. 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) VisionEval Introduction**

MR. JONGENELEN presented the VisionEval.

There were no comments.

MR. TROMBLEY moved to postpone Agenda Items 6.b. and 6.c. to the next PC meeting.  
ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL seconded.

***Hearing no objections, this motion passed.***

**b. Transportation Systems Management & Operations (TSMO) Plan**

**c. Transportation Systems Management & Operations (TSMO) Update**

**7. GENERAL INFORMATION - None**

**8. COMMITTEE COMMENTS - None**

**9. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

MR. JONGENELEN was directed by the Committee to read the written public comments into the record. The following comments were read:

CAMERON COLE is writing in support of AR 2022-254 and encouraged you to do the same. Transportation is fundamental to a community and its environment, and he believed these measures can improve our municipality by diversifying and making safe, varied modes of transportation while also reducing congestion and greenhouse gas emissions. Please support this study today or this study of best practices in today's meeting to ensure we tread and drive and ride in the best path in the future.

BILL HERMAN was unable to testify in person at your meeting today but would like to offer written testimony to today's considerations. Your effort is to do comprehensive planning for the future. A futuristic plan must include adapting to increasing problems due to human-caused climate change. That change, scientists say, is increasing global warming in our region, but more than two times that of the rest of the world. Creating an urban Anchorage that is more people-friendly and better for the environment, not by constructing larger freeways is where you should be headed. He, therefore, supports AR 2022-254 from the Anchorage Assembly that asks your Committee to strengthen bike and pedestrian improvements with trails and pedestrian-friendly roads. He especially supports full-funding for greenhouse gas emission measurement and a reduction in transportation systems. We need to become results-oriented about climate. Measuring and setting reduced targets for emissions is a very critical component.

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

MR. TROMBLEY moved to adjourn. ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR seconded.

*Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 3:41 p.m.*