

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
Planning & Development Center  
Main Conference Room, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor  
4700 Elmore Road  
Anchorage, Alaska**

**July 8, 2021  
2:30 PM**

Technical Advisory Committee Members Present:

Name	Representing
Kim Carpenter	MOA/Traffic Engineering Department
Todd Vanhove	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF), Central Region Planning
Matt Stichick	MOA/Anchorage Health Department (AHD)
Jamie Acton	MOA/Public Transportation Department (PTD)
Michelle McNulty	MOA/Planning Department
Luke Bowland	DOT&PF
Brian Lindamood	Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)
Cindy Heil	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)
Kent Kohlhase	MOA/Project Management & Engineering (PM&E)
Shaina Kilcoyne	MOA/Energy and Sustainability

Also in attendance:

Name	Representing
Craig Lyon	MOA/Planning
Christine Schuette	MOA/Planning
Aaron Jongenelen	MOA/Planning
Jon Cecil	MOA/Planning
Joni Wilm	MOA/Planning
Jim Amundsen	DOT&PF
James Starzec	DOT&PF
Wolfgang Junge*	DOT&PF
John Weddleton*	MOA/Municipal Assembly
Adam Trombley	MOA/Executive Director, Community Development
Tom Davis	MOA/Long-Range Planning Division
Bart Rudolph	MOA/PTD
Meg Zaletel*	MOA/Municipal Assembly
Barbara Carlson	
Noah King	DOT&PF
Amanda Beaujean	
Philana Miles	DOT&PF
Adam Moser	DOT&PF
Renee Whitesell	DOWL
Brad Coy	DOWL

*\*Policy Committee Member*

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

ACTING CHAIR CARPENTER called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. Mr. Ribuffo was absent. A quorum was established prior to Ms. Heil's arrival at 2:32 p.m.

**2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT**

CRAIG LYON 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**

MS. MCNULTY moved to approve the agenda. MR. VANHOVE seconded.

MR. LYON noted that, if time allowed, he had been asked to add a project update for the Chugach Way Transportation Element Study as a general information item.

MS. MCNULTY moved to amend the agenda. MR. VANHOVE seconded.

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

**4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – June 10, 2021**

MS. HEIL moved to approve the minutes. MS. MCNULTY seconded.

*Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.*

**5. BUSINESS ITEMS**

**a. Non-motorized Plan Public Review Draft**

**BACKGROUND:**

*AMATS staff would like to request approval to proceed with incorporating the public comments for the AMATS Non-motorized Plan. The plan was released for a 62-day public review and comment period from January 1, 2021 through March 5, 2021. Comments were categorized by type and they consist of the following: AMATS staff conducted a work session on Tuesday, June 29, 2021, to gather feedback from both the AMATS Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Policy Committee (PC) on the Comment/Response Summary and table. All advisory committee feedback has been incorporated into the table.*

MS. WILM briefed the Committee on the draft noting that, of the 762 comments received, the majority of the comments were asking for different projects or to add to an existing project.

MS. MCNULTY noted that there was a lot of mention of deferment to a further maintenance conversation and asked if that had been scheduled.

MS. WILM would like to schedule a virtual or hybrid maintenance forum in August to discuss all the maintenance related comments.

There were no public comments.

MS. MCNULTY moved to approve the comments. MS. ACTON seconded.

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

### **b. 2023-2026 TIP Criteria Update**

#### **BACKGROUND:**

*The TIP criteria are periodically updated to reflect the current goals of the MPO, the Federal requirements, the State of Alaska goals, the Municipality of Anchorage (MOA) goals, and the nationwide changes that happen regarding transportation. The 2021 TIP criteria update incorporated, where possible, the MOA 2040 Land Use Plan update, the AMATS Non-motorized Plan update, the AMATS Spenard Corridor Plan, AMATS Complete Street Policy, and the Anchorage Climate Action Plan. AMATS staff updated the ranking and scoring criteria and the AMATS Policy and Technical Advisory Committees met in two work sessions as well.*

MR. LYON reminded the Committee that these are criteria used when we receive the project nominations to be ranked, scored, and put into the next TIP four-year program of projects for the AMATS allocation. If necessary, the projects are updated due to Federal regulations and tweaked in order to make them a little more objective. After incorporating the comments heard during the work session, these criteria are substantially different than the first draft. The Committee is being asked to recommend the Policy Committee release these for a 30-day public comment review.

MS. HEIL had the following questions with responses noted in *Italic*.

(CH) During the work session she had requested a one-page table of the criteria that just showed points making it easy to view, but it was not included.

(AJ) *It was created, just not printed.*

(CH) Pointed out that all the points were made equal with 2020...2020, which is different than what was presented at the work session.

(AJ) *He reminded Ms. Heil that she had mentioned, during the work session, that it was going to be both of the Committees different purviews to see how we wanted to assign the scoring to each area. Our MTP does not rank our goals, so it was awkward to have safety with the highest scoring points when it was not actually discussed as a group that it should receive the highest scoring points, so we*

*decided to make them equal using a 100 scale. The TAC and PC should be prioritizing those that are most important, not staff.*

(CH) Does the Federal program assign priorities to the goals?

(AJ) *No, they do not. The National Planning Factors and Goals do not assign priority. The State's Long-Range Plan also does not assign priority of what is their most important. We did look at other MPOs and they were mostly equal with a only a few of them having a one-point difference between them.*

(CH) A lot of times using criteria is being able to differentiate projects. This has two projects that are the same and when the projects go through this criterion, your hope is that the criteria will differentiate and put one above the other. She asked if staff had a chance to take two projects and run it through the draft criteria to see if it is working from that perspective at all.

(AJ) *No. Staff did not have a lot of time to test these between the last work session and this meeting. He thinks the possibility is there for that to happen because of how we had it set up with bonus points. Positive and negative points can be assigned to projects based on certain data. For example, safety talks about the effectiveness of countermeasures. If you have two areas with the same crash statistics and both are encountering the exact same countermeasure and the same effectiveness, the hope is that some of the other criteria will weigh out. The reality is there may be similar projects. We did add more subjective than objective criteria to help counterbalance allowing some flexibility on the projects. Otherwise, it would be so rigid that you would have to select the first project, even if it is a \$150 million project that you cannot afford in the TIP.*

(CJ) *Added that some testing was done using the earlier version.*

(CH) By the time it gets through the public comment period and comes back before the TAC, that layout listing existing projects and how to address comments would be handy to have.

MR. JONGENELEN was able to display the document Ms. Heil had requested showing the points broken down.

There were no public comments.

MS. HEIL moved to approve release of the draft criteria for public comment. MS. MCNULTY seconded.

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

**c. AMATS TIP 2019-2022 TIP Amendment #2 Air Quality Conformity****BACKGROUND:**

*The Municipality of Anchorage contains a Limited Maintenance Area for carbon monoxide (CO) in Anchorage and contains 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 future emissions from the transportation network envisioned in these plans and programs remain under the allowable emissions budget established in the State Implementation Plan 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.*

*AMATS' proposed Amendment #2 to the 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) includes the addition of a new road project after the FHWA's approval of an Air Quality Conformity Determination for that TIP. Hence, the updated air quality conformity report is being presented to obtain a new conformity determination for the modified 2019-2022 TIP, including the new Academy/Vanguard Traffic Circulation Improvements project being added via TIP Amendment #2. The analysis demonstrates that Anchorage is well-positioned to maintain the CO NAAQS. Anchorage Air Program staff has also determined that the 2019–2022 TIP, including Amendment #2 is consistent with the Alaska State Implementation Plan in finding that no element of the Anchorage 2019–2022 TIP or its amendments will undermine the objective to reduce ambient CO in Anchorage, nor will it interfere with implementation of any CO control measure identified in the Alaska SIP. The Interagency Consultation Team met and members agreed that the contents of the draft conformity determination report, along with a review of the most recent monitor data statistics characterizing the Anchorage CO and Eagle River PM10 Limited Maintenance Areas is appropriate to update the conformity for the 2019-2022 TIP, including Amendment #2.*

MR. LYON addressed the information detailed in the background shown above.

MS. HEIL explained that a determination is required to spend money in a maintenance area. Federal dollars cannot be spent in a maintenance area unless you show it will not exacerbate your air quality problems. A maintenance area for Particulate Matter (PM) is in Eagle River and a maintenance area exists for Carbon Monoxide (CO) in Anchorage. We are in what is called a Limited Maintenance Plan and had our application to EPA approved allowing us to use a modified conforming determination without the use of modeling, which is much cheaper for AMATS to amend the TIP using actual monitoring data. This determination just says that we look at all the monitoring data and meet all the monitoring criteria, and we are way below the standard. Also, that we are continuing to commit to our transportation control measures or any of our air quality related SIP items, and that everything is fiscally constrained. What is important about the air quality conformity is that FHWA approves the conformity determination, not the amendment. If your conformity determination is not approvable, then FHWA will not give you any money. That is why DEC ensures all Air Quality Conformity Determinations are done correctly and follows regulations. The Municipality has been very proactive in putting dust palliatives on the streets in Eagle River during the Spring preventing us from exceeding our Limited Maintenance Plan requirements for PM-10.

There were no comments.

MS. HEIL moved to approve the Air Quality Conformity Determination for the TIP Amendment #2. MS. MCNULTY seconded.

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

#### **d. AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Amendment #2**

##### **BACKGROUND:**

*An amendment to the AMATS 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is needed to update Table 2 – Roadway; Table 3 - Non-Motorized; Table 4 – Studies; Table 5 – CMAQ; Table 6 – TAP; Table 8 – HSIP; Table 10 – Transit; and Table 11 - Other.*

*Additionally, the AMATS 2019-2022 TIP allocation is updated to reflect the approved 2020-2023 STIP Amendment #1, which shows a slight increase in the STBG and CMAQ funding for AMATS in 2021 and 2022. The updates are listed below.*

##### **Table 2 – Roadway**

- 2159 O'Malley Road Reconstruction – Decrease funding in FY2021 to reflect obligated amount.
- RDY00001 Fireweed Lane Rehabilitation – Move the ROW phase from FY2021 to beyond FY2022, add a design hit for \$1M in FY2022, and updated the beyond FY2022 funding amount from \$6M to \$47M to reflect the increase in project cost.
- RDY00002 C Street/Ocean Dock Road Ramp and Intersection Improvements – Removed this project.
- RDY00003 Spenard Road Rehab – Removed the last sentence of the project description that limited improvements at the intersection of Minnesota and Spenard, add a design hit for \$1.5M in FY2021, moved the ROW hit from FY2022 to beyond FY2022, and updated the beyond FY2022 funding from \$40M to \$55M to reflect the increase in project cost.
- RDY00004 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr Avenue Extension – moved a design hit from FY2021 to FY2022 and increased the amount from \$500K to \$2M, and updated the beyond FY2022 funding amount from \$14.5M to \$9.270M to reflect a decrease in project cost.
- RDY00006 East 4th Ave Signal and Lighting Upgrade – removed the design hit listed in project phasing for FY2020, moved the construction hit in FY2022 to beyond FY2022 and reduced the amount from \$7.1M to \$4.950M, moved the ROW hit from FY2021 to FY2022 and increased the amount from \$224K to \$324K.
- RDY00007 Potter Drive Rehabilitation – moved the design hit in FY2021 to FY2022 and increased the amount from \$750K to \$1.250M, moved the ROW hit in FY2022 to beyond 2022, and updated the beyond FY2022 amount from \$6.5M to \$5.5M to reflect a decrease in project cost.
- RDY00009 Seward Highway to Glenn Highway Connection PEL Design – removed the FY2022 design hit.
- RDY000012 Pavement Replacement – increased the FY2021 funding from \$4,839 to \$8,624 and increased the FY2022 funding from \$1,580 to \$4,777.

- Added a new project RDY000013 Academy Drive/Vanguard Drive Area Traffic Circulation Improvements.

**Table 3 – Non-Motorized**

- NMO00001 Downtown Trail Connection – updated the FY2021 funding to show a design hit and increase the amount from \$1M to \$1.6M.
- NMO00002 Fish Creek Trail Connection – updated the FY2022 ROW hit to be a design hit instead and increase the amount from \$500K to \$1.010M and update the beyond FY2022 funding from \$3M to \$7.1M to reflect a project cost increase.
- NMO00003 Tudor Road Pathway Connection – removed this project as it is being constructed as part of the TAP00001 Chugach Foothills Connector Phase II project.
- NMO00006 Potter Marsh Improvements – updated the FY2022 U/C hit from \$480K to \$510K to reflect a project cost increase.
- NMO00008 Anchorage Areawide Pathway Trails Pavement Replacement – increase the 2021 funding from \$1,180M to \$2,382M, and decreased the FY2022 funding from \$5.710M to \$830K.

**Table 4 – Studies**

- PLN00007 Port of Alaska Multimodal Improvements Study – added a funding hit of \$150K in FY2021.
- Added project PLN00009 AMATS Safety Plan in FY2022 for \$250K - This study will create a comprehensive safety plan that will provide a coordinated framework for reducing fatalities and serious injuries on the surface transportation network in the AMATS planning area.

**Table 5 – CMAQ**

- CMQ00005 Bus Stop & Facility Improvements – increased the FY2019 funding to reflect additional FTA funding outside the AMATS allocation.
- CMQ00007 Capital Vehicles – increased the FY2019 funding to reflect additional FTA funding outside the AMATS allocation and increased the FY2022 funding from \$2.210M to \$11.981M.

**Table 6 – TAP**

- TAP00001 Chugach Foothills Connector, Phase II – increased the funding for a design hit in FY2021 and the construction hit in FY2021.

**Table 8 – HSIP**

- Updated Table 8 to reflect the HSIP changes submitted by Alaska DOT&PF.

**Table 10 – Transit**

- Updated Table 10 to reflect changes submitted by MOA Public Transportation Department and the Alaska Railroad Corporation.

**Table 11 – Other**

- Updated Table 11 to identify the funding source for project OFS00005 Buses and Bus Facilities Infrastructure Investment Project.

MR. LYON explained that the main reason for the amendment was the addition of the Academy/Vanguard project. An amendment is required anytime a project is added or deleted. The Assembly recommended approval with no changes.

MR. JONGENELEN pointed out that beyond the 2022 limit of funding it went from approximately \$105 million to \$174 million, which is a significant increase with some of the project changes. Beyond 2022 is what we look at as part of the next TIP, and beyond that. The reason he mentioned this is because \$100 million is easy to spread amongst the four years of the TIP, but \$174 million is much harder when it is just roadway. There are a lot of expectations floating out there from members of the public regarding projects that are going to be moving forward in our TIP. He wanted everyone to be aware that there is a significant roadblock coming up.

MR. LYON added that, basically, what happened is that we had several projects nominated for the TIP and this was the dollar figure given us, and this is how much we expect it to cost. When getting further down the road in doing some design, they realized they needed additional things done, such as more right-of-way. As a result, a lot of those projects ballooned significantly. Those construction phases are larger and farther out, and not in this four-year life cycle, but that is something we will have to decide what to do as we move forward.

MS. MCNULTY asked if there could be projects that come under and if that would help.

MR. LYON replied, yes, there are projects that can come under, but he cannot imagine they would fill a \$75 million gap.

MR. AMUNDSEN explained that it is a concern, but it is less of a problem than what Mr. Jongenelen is pointing out for the simple fact that several of the projects we are talking about are not projects that are on a four-year time cycle. It is going to take six to eight, maybe ten years to get them through their full project development because they are going to be very complex with a lot of challenges in terms of dealing with adjacent right-of-way and acquiring the necessary right-of-way. Working through that process is more time consuming, so expecting them to be delivered within a four-year timeline is not realistic for several of the projects.

MS. MCNULTY asked if that means we would have the opportunity to put those additional funds into the next TIP to offset that excess?

MR. AMUNDSEN replied, yes, that is it exactly. Instead of all of that \$175 million being in the four-year window, a portion will be within it and probably roughly within the \$100 million limit that we try to target. The rest of the \$75 million is probably in the next six to eight years, which would be the next TIP. Realistically that is where this would spread out. He agreed with Mr. Jongenelen that we do need to keep an eye on that making sure we do not exceed the amount.

There were no public comments.

MR. VANHOVE moved that the TAC recommend approval to the Policy Committee of the 2019-2022 TIP Amendment #2. MS. HEIL seconded.

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



## 6. PROJECT AND PLAN UPDATES

### a. MLK Project Update

NOAH KING with DOT&PF provided a PowerPoint Presentation.

MR. VANHOVE commented that this project's scope purpose and need is based on the fact of the development of that other property. He asked if it had been considered, within the development of this project, that that property is no longer being developed and the purpose and need of this project still exists. What is the point of building this project and disrupting an entire neighborhood if that development will not happen?

ADAM TROMBLEY asked why there is no roundabout based on traffic flow when heading west.

MR. KING explained that a roundabout will still be considered. Currently, there is not enough right-of-way resulting in a larger impact at Piper. There just is not enough space to put one.

MS. MCNULTY understands that just because that development did not go with what the developer intended, the site is still being rezoned and replatted and can be redeveloped. Just because that one development did not go through does not mean we do not get that site development ready. To her, the purpose and need is not totally out the window.

MS. ZALETEL noted that the original justification was to pull traffic off Tudor Road. She asked if Mr. King had an estimate of how many cars are expected to be pulled away from Tudor Road with this redesign, or any of the alternatives.

MR. KING explained that there is an estimate of the traffic that will be generated from the development and use this instead of Tudor, but he did not have anything official.

MS. ZALETEL referred to her discussion with the Campbell Park Community Council noting that there is a lot of conversation about what can be done to pull more traffic off Tudor Road to relieve some of the congestion and safety issues. She asked if there would be independent utility regardless of the development and if it would still pull traffic, especially traffic that might be coming up Elmore Road.

MR. KING expressed that they have not looked at that specifically.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER WEDDLETON noted that, when looking at the actual position of the old Tozier Track, it seems like it chops up some valuable land.

MR. KING explained that it is based on the curve radius of the south end when starting to head north. That is the tightest it can fit in while trying to stay the furthest to the east and not be too near the property on the west side. It is a result of the design criteria.

MR. AMUNDSEN added that it could slide east or west as they get into final design. The radius of curve stays the same, but where you start and end your radius could be shoved further west or east to minimize running it right up the middle of that whole property.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER WEDDLETON commented that they paid \$5 million for that and he wants a lot more than just a road on there.

MS. ZALETEL asked that if we are putting a Collector Road around there, then why would the local roads, particularly the one through Tozier Track and the other one to the east, be necessary?

MR. KING replied that it is just to fill the purpose and need of connecting and providing access to that lot. They do not necessarily need to be in that configuration, and we are assuming there will be a developer to work with.

There were no further comments.

#### **b. Title 21 Parking Requirements Presentation**

TOM DAVIS, MOA Long-Range Planning Division, provided a PowerPoint Presentation and responded to questions.

ACTING CHAIR CARPENTER opened the floor to comments.

BRAD COY with DOWL asked if the developers would be interested in reductions to the minimum parking requirements.

MR. DAVIS explained that it varies sometimes by the type of use and by site. With residential, some people ask for parking reductions, but generally, people are providing the minimum parking required.

MS. MCNULTY added that after dealing with the different residential projects submitted to the Planning Department, it is not so much that it is easier to not get a reduction. Often, it would be easier if they did do a reduction because then they would not have to try and fit the required parking onsite. Often, they chose to provide all required parking because they know their tenants needs. Depending on where the residential is, they are trying to rent to a certain market, but know that market will at least demand one parking space per unit, sometimes two. It does depend on the type of development, but we often see developers not take the parking reduction. If we make these changes and start to see affected behavior with people living closer to transit lines; and we start to put more money towards the maintenance of clearing transit lines and pedestrian routes, then people will, maybe, start to shed that extra car, and we will hopefully start to see the market respond by wanting that lower parking. For instance, Downtown does not have a parking requirement and keep residential development Downtown that does not have parking because they know the market and how Alaskans are with their kayaks and whatnot and shipping off to weekend getaways. We think this is still a step in the right direction. One of the concerns heard from the public and some of the other departments is about maintaining snow. It is important to remember there is already a lot of development in this town, so it is not like it is going to shift to where people suddenly find there is no onsite parking. This is really going to affect more infill development and you will not see huge impacts across the city, but it is going to be spotted. It does free up where we have a lot of surface parking for people to do more infill and vertical development.

BARBARA CARLSON commented that she is glad to see consideration for more bike parking to encourage non-motorized travel.

MS. KILCOYNE thanked everyone for all the research done to present this to the Committee. She liked seeing that this has alignment with some of our plans, including the Climate Action Plan to encourage alternative modes of transportation.

## **7. GENERAL INFORMATION**

### **a. Chugach Way Transportation Element Study**

RENEE WHITESELL with DOWL provided a PowerPoint Presentation via Teams.

ACTING CHAIR CARPENTER asked for comments.

BART RUDOLPH with PTD noted that transit routes are located on Arctic Boulevard and Spenard Road, and one is being added on 36th Avenue. A lot of the population to the south of Chugach Way do access those lines via Chugach Way, so pedestrian facilities are pretty important for Public Transit's ridership, and it is decent ridership in that area.

JAMES STARZEC with DOT&PF pointed out that a lot of the recommendations seem to require additional right-of-way. There are a lot of properties in this area and if you were to expand the width of the roadway, it would be impacting. He asked if she had considered what positive outcome alternative might be available if expansion of the right-of-way was not an option.

MS. WHITESELL explained that this is one of the reasons we are really wanting to talk to land developers over the next month or two. Early feedback has been that they are receptive to widening the right-of-way as part of implementing development, but we are aware that we are dealing with a very narrow and very constrained right-of-way in this location. She appreciated the reminder that this is key to supporting several of the alternatives that are being considered right now.

MS. WILM expressed that there are a few examples available of street sectionals in the Spenard Corridor Plan that specifically addressed roads like Chugach Way with limited 30-foot right-of-way, and ways we can improve the street for bicyclists and pedestrians. This element has been approved and adopted.

MS. MCNULTY asked Ms. Whitesell if they had considered the Woonerfs street option, which allows a little more flexibility in how pedestrian rights-of-way are done and can also be used as traffic calming

MS. WHITESELL, replied, no, but she would like to connect with Ms. McNulty to discuss this option.

## **8. COMMITTEE COMMENTS - None**

**9. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None**

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

*Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 3:58 p.m.*