

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
Planning & Development Center
Main Conference Room, 1st Floor
4700 Elmore August**

**November 04, 2021
2:30 PM**

Technical Advisory Committee Members Present:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Brad Coy	MOA/Traffic Engineering Department
Brian Lindamood	Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)
Todd Vanhove	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF), Central Region Planning
Luke Bowland	DOT&PF
Cindy Heil	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)
Matt Stichick	MOA/Anchorage Health Department (AHD)
Michelle McNulty	MOA/Planning Department
Jamie Acton	MOA/Public Transportation Department

Also in attendance:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Craig Lyon	MOA/Planning
Aaron Jongenelen	MOA/Planning
Christine Schuette	MOA/Planning
Jon Cecil	MOA/Planning
Joni Wilm	MOA/Planning
Jim Amundsen	DOT&PF
James Starzec	DOT&PF
Wolfgang Junge*	DOT&PF
Tom Davis	MOA/Long-Range Planning Division
Bart Rudolph	MOA/PTD
John Linnell	DOT&PF
Ben Coleman	R&M Consultants
LaQuita Chmielowski	DOWL
Renee Whitesell	DOWL
Walker Ryan Harris	DOT&PF
Steve Johnson	
Tom Davis	MOA, Long-Range Planning Division
Elizabeth Appleby	MOA, Planning Department
Steven Rzepka	DOT&PF
Sean Baski	DOT&PF
Travis Holmes	DOT&PF
Nancy Pease	

**Policy Committee Member*

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

CHAIR COY called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m. Shaina Kilcoyne was absent. Steve Ribuffo and Kent Kohlhasse were excused. A quorum was established.

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

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

Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – October 14, 2021

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

Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

a. Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Goals and Objectives

BACKGROUND:

The AMATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Goals and Objectives were based on the 2040 MTP and have been refined to reflect comments heard during the 2040 MTP that were not addressed during that update, the 2040 Land Use Plan, the AMATS Non-Motorized Plan, the AMATS Spenard Corridor Plan, the MOA Climate Action Plan, and to ensure conformance with the FAST Act.

MR. JONGENELEN provided a PowerPoint Presentation explaining the following:

- Goal 2 and objectives were refined to be more achievable and measurable. One objective was removed as it was redundant.
- Goal 3 and objectives were refined to emphasize connectivity, mobility, equitability, and to strengthen the connection between land use and transportation. 5 objectives were removed as they were redundant and/or something that is hard for AMATS to affect.
- Goal 4 and objectives were refined to be more achievable and measurable.

- Goal 5 was split into two goals (5&6) and the objectives were refined to focus on a health, the environment, and climate change. Two objectives were moved to Goal 4, one was removed due to redundancy, and two were moved to the new Goal 6.
- Goal 6 is a new goal with three objectives that focus on providing equity throughout the transportation planning process.
- Removal of Goal 7 and objectives as they were redundant with other goals and objectives and didn't help to support the new goal of Equitability.

The following are questions and comments by the Committee and the public with responses noted in *Italic*.

(TV) In Goal 2A, serious injuries were removed.

(AJ) *That is covered under severity. It is not just helping to reduce serious injuries and fatalities, it is also the other accidents that happen that are not necessarily considered part of the serious injuries with fatalities.*

(BC) With regard to 2C, the FAST Act conformance mentions safety and security, but does not give too much detail. He asked Mr. Jongenelen to speak to the security and what it is referring to by that.

(AJ) *When we originally looked at that as part of the 2040 MTP, we thought it meant resiliency and how secure can transportation be against resiliency with climate change or natural disasters. That is resiliency on its own, so security is more about when people use the transportation system and how secure they feel. Does someone feel secure when walking down a pathway, does it have enough lighting, or do they feel secure when driving a car? We felt that was addressed through our objectives because we are talking about minimizing conflicts, reducing unsafe behaviors, and awareness that helps with that feeling of safeness for people utilizing the transportation system.*

(BC) When speaking to Goal 3, he was curious about the “allows people to succeed” and asked if that was from other examples.

(BR) *Explained that it comes from the idea of access to opportunity, time, and economic prosperity that if people have these options to get where they need to go, they could succeed in however they feel they need to, whether it is in a job or education, or anything that we would use the transportation network for. It is another way of saying “access to opportunity”.*

(BC) It is trying to help us realize that transportation is not just a means on its own but is helping the public and others to have a life benefit.

(AJ) *Yes, it does tie in with one of our later goals with equity.*

(WJ) With regard to 3C and the 2040 MTP, was it removed?

- (AJ) *It was removed because it is hard for us to affect as AMATS.*
- (BC) With regard to 3D, instead of the multi-modal being at the end of this goal moving forward, you would say it adds the multi-modal connectivity, and that is when the connectivity applies to the whole statement.
- (AJ) *That is a good idea. He did not see any problem with that as it does make a lot more sense. Let us know if you want to do that now before the public comment period, or if that is something we can do as part of the public comment period, then talk about making any changes to the objective and shift it away from what we were intending.*
- (BC) It sounds like it meets the intent. He would be fine with whatever works for your process.
- (BC) 3H: Regarding the winter city portion, he asked if the primary design situation was winter. What do we do in designing for summer versus winter and how we think about facilities that we are recommending, or designs that we are doing? Is that in line with what this is saying?
- (AJ) *Yes, we are trying to get help with this in that we do have a large portion of the year where we have winter vacation, so when designing a facility, that is what we will need to be looking at primarily.*
- (BC) 3L: Was there anything from the ICM study?
- (AJ) *No. Those were all project-specific things that we will be able to look at later. We felt it was covered under 2.B.1., reducing timely emergency response and efficiency in the transportation system. This covers it because we are asking how we can help to ensure these non-recurring congestion incidents minimize their impact to the transportation system.*
- (BC) 5D: Looks like there is a typographical error in two that should read, "...in order to ensure..."
- (BC) 6B: The prior one does have some specifics, which is helpful to understand what it is getting at. Are those going to be captured somewhere else if they are not specifically pointed out? It does not have to be included in here, he just did not want to lose those details.
- (AJ) *Will need to speak with the project team and see what we want to do. That is something we can look at as a definition that talks about some examples of adverse impacts. What is good about this one is that it matches up to our TIP criteria well because we do talk about adverse impacts to the populations and we do list what those are, so maybe we can do something similar here; and have some definitions or examples for people to look at. Those specific ones are not called out in the TIP because we were trying to be more inclusive since they were a little limited, but he will take a look at it and see if there is something else.*

- (MS) The overall goal for safety was to increase attentiveness. He was not sure how we, as AMATS, would go about doing that or even measuring it. With regard to 3D, which was to improve multi-modal access, it seems it often directly conflicts with improving safety and conflicts with other transportation modes. He was wondering if we should not say something to the effect of “improves safety and security for all modes of transit”? In speaking to safety, is it feasible for us?
- (AJ) *Did you mean 2C?*
- (MS) Thought the 3D statement for safety was to increase attentiveness.
- (AJ) *No, that is a specific portion of objective 2C.*
- (MS) My comment there is that it sounds like a great goal for APD. He is not sure how we, as AMATS, affect that.
- (AJ) *We could do things like funding programs about awareness, distracted driving, etc. Attentiveness applies to people as they are walking or biking, as well as making sure having things like reflective gear on. Those are options that we can do, it is not just project related.*
- (MS) Do you see the potential conflicts between improving multi-modal access and the safety and reducing conflicting goals because, if I am a bicyclist, I would much rather take C Street with limited access than Lake Otis or Old Seward Highway with lots of crossings. It seems to him that improving access points for multi-modal access conflicts with safety and decreasing conflicts with other travel modes. He would be more advocating for dedicated multi-modal transit options.
- (AJ) *Did not see a conflict. He did see them working hand-in-hand because part of what you want to do is minimize the conflicts between them, so how do you do that while providing increased access?*
- (MS) Oh, you are talking about access through the transportation network as a whole. He was thinking of access points.
- (AJ) *That could include access points. If talking about adding a driveway, you do need to be aware of the inherent safety concerns that come with that driveway. We would want to discuss that if we were to put that driveway in, what that does to the users of the facility.*
- (WJ) He sent Mr. Lyon Washington’s equity assessment of their Department of Transportation and asked him to review how they assess equity within their transportation system, and cross-reference it with some of the goals and objectives and measurement standards. There are a few things, such as homelessness.

NANCY PEASE emphasized the discussion earlier about the impacts under Goal 5, with regard to traffic speeding and noise pollution, etc. In her comments she talked about natural resource categories like water resources and habitat. In addition, Goal 5C from the previous iteration called out stormwater. She understood that objectives do not have to be numerical, but that could be done under Performance Measures and Targets. The objectives should be thorough in their categorization, so she would urge the TAC to retain some of the categories of environmental concerns, specifically 5C (stormwater), 5F (through traffic/speeding/noise pollution), and 5G, which talks about aspects of a natural environment, such as watersheds and parklands. That categorization is the public knowledge that those standards will be looked at with Performance Measures and Targets.

- (BC) Will those comments be included as part of the record? When it does go to public review at that point, will there be opportunity for those to submit comments? How do the comments we have made today get incorporated?
- (AJ) *Only if the Committee includes it as part of its recommendation. The public can provide their comments during the TAC meeting and, if the Committee decides to act on them, staff will be asked to address these before releasing them. The Policy Committee would also need to approve that. The public can also comment during the public comment period, and we can include them in a Comment/Response Summary and address it then. If the Committee is wanting to make any changes, they would be included as part of the motion.*
- (MM) Appreciated where the public is coming from regarding the targets. Measuring targets takes a lot of staff resources. We need to establish baselines, and the program for which those measures are documented and measured. She cautioned that saying, right out of the gate, that we are going to have these metrics we need to be able to measure because she thinks we need to first take a step saying that we want to start measuring these things because some departments may not have the resources, and it may take longer to do that because something else came up. These need to be thoughtfully integrated. Again, she cautioned when putting in targets, we think about the impacts.
- (AJ) *Our plan is to have the public comment period, take what is received from the public, update the Goals and Objectives where we can, move forward, and not bring them back before the TAC. You will see them again during the Performance Measures and Targets and we will inform everyone of any substantial changes.*
- (BC) When talking about the Public Involvement Plan (PIP), the comments need to be ready, but do not need to be changed before going to the Policy Committee. When all the comments are received from the public review period, can what was said today also be incorporated?
- (AJ) *He did not see why not. The preferred option is to incorporate them as part of the public comment period.*

(MS) If you have a specific request, it makes sense to put it formally as a comment or a response.

(CL) *Some suggested language for a motion would read, "Comments received in this chat are included as part of the public comments".*

MS. PEASE encouraged the TAC to suggest any substantial changes now. AMATS intends to start on the performance standards and criteria in January 2022, right after the public comment period closes. It seems as if the TAC should take a second look, but that is not in the schedule.

MR. STICHICK moved to recommend the Policy Committee release for a 30-day public comment period the proposed Goals and Objectives and include the comments received today as part of the public comment period. MR. VANHOVE seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

6. PROJECT AND PLAN UPDATES - None

7. GENERAL INFORMATION

a. Northern Lights Boulevard – Minnesota Drive to Seward Highway Sidewalks Project - DOWL

SEAN BASKI with DOT&PF provided a PowerPoint Presentation.

MS. MCNULTY asked for clarification that repairing southside sidewalks or the north side, means "as is" and not making them compliant?

MR. BASKI explained, for example, the cross-slopes are more than two percent. It would be bringing them into compliance from a cross-slope perspective. We are not talking about widening these five-foot sidewalks to six- or eight-foot sidewalks. We are not talking about a separated facility, just replacing in place and trying to fix cracks and things that make them non-ADA compliant.

MR. RUDOLPH noted that if they will be touching the bus stops on the north side, they would have to be ADA compliant, meaning that a five-by-eight right-of-way would be a big concern. Does that \$1 million include the additional right-of-way you would need for those five-by-eight bus stops?

MR. BASKI replied, no, it is another aspect of the project that we can include. It carries its own dollar amount.

CHAIR COY asked, regarding ADA compliant curb ramps, does one of the intersections usually touch more of the intersection?

MR. BASKI replied, sure. The most recent Northern Lights Pavement Preservation Project that went through and reconstructed all the curb ramps, a couple of them have little minor things that need to be fixed, but, largely, they are all compliant. We are trying to get the best bang for our buck by targeting specific issues. You might have a new stretch of sidewalk right next to existing sidewalks that have been there for many decades.

MS. MCNULTY asked how come there is not an ADA compliant just on the north side option? She would like for it to be the side that has the most bus stops.

MR. BASKI explained that we could list 15 or 20 different alternatives, but this is just an example of things. We can mix and match. The easiest side is the least expensive side to make completely ADA compliant, and that would be the south side.

CHAIR COY asked the purpose and need and what the project is trying to accomplish?

MR. BASKI noted that there is not a lot of definition in the TIP for scoping on any of these projects, but what we imagine it to be is to try to address non-compliance in an overall space.

b. Chugach Way Study – DOWL

LAQUITA CHMIELOWSKI with DOWL provided a PowerPoint Presentation.

There were no comments.

c. Title 21 Parking Amendment – Public Release Draft

ELIZABETH APPLEBY and TOM DAVIS with the MOA Planning Department provided a PowerPoint Presentation.

There were no comments.

8. COMMITTEE COMMENT

CHAIR COY announced that the new driveway standards were just recently published.

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

10. ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 4:29 p.m.