

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

**February 10, 2022
2:30 PM**

Technical Advisory Committee Members Present:

Name	Representing
Brad Coy (Chair)	MOA/Traffic Engineering Department
Craig Lyon	MOA/Planning Department
Brian Lindamood	Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)
Todd Vanhove	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF), Central Region Planning
Steve Ribuffo	MOA/Port of Alaska
Kent Kohlhase	MOA/Project Management & Engineering (PM&E)
Matt Stichick	MOA/Anchorage Health Department (AHD)
Luke Bowland	DOT&PF
Cindy Heil	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)
Jamie Acton	MOA/Public Transportation Department (PTD)

Also in attendance:

Name	Representing
Aaron Jongenelen	MOA/Planning
Christine Schuette	MOA/Planning
Jon Cecil	MOA/Planning
James Starzec	DOT&PF
Wolfgang Junge*	DOT&PF
Scott Thomas	DOT&PF
Taryn Oleson-Yelle	R&M Consultants
Van Le	R&M Consultants
Ben Coleman	R&M Consultants
Morgan McCammon	
Bart Rudolph	PTD
Adeyemi Alimi	ADEC
Kathryn Wenger	Federal Highways Administration (FHWA)
Kevin Jason	
John Linnell	DOT&PF
Sean Baski	DOT&PF
John Weddleton*	MOA/Municipal Assembly
Noel Rea	
Michael Fenster	AMATS Community Advisory Committee (CAC)
Travis Holmes	DOT&PF
Christina Huber	DOT&PF
Dave Gamez	Lounsbury & Associates

**Policy Committee Member*

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

CHAIR COY called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. Shaina Kilcoyne was absent. A quorum was established prior to Ms. Acton's arrival at 2:33 p.m.

2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

AARON JONGENELEN encouraged public involvement in this meeting of the AMATS Technical Advisory 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. Each public participant will be allotted three minutes to speak on their topic.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. LYON moved to approve the agenda. MR. STICHICK seconded.

Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – January 13, 2022

MR. LYON moved to approve the minutes. MR. RIBUFFO seconded.

Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.

Ms. Acton joined the meeting at 2:33 p.m.

5. ACTION ITEMS

a. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment #3 – Air Quality Conformity Determination Release for 30-day Public Comment Period

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 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.

AMATS has proposed Amendment #3 to the 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) to modify the fiscal programming schedule for three roadway projects, one Transportation Demand Management study, two transit improvement projects, and six projects for maintenance and upgrade of existing Alaska Railroad rail infrastructure, communication system and signaling improvements, and preventative maintenance of

passenger railcars and locomotives. Amongst all the project modifications proposed in Amendment #3, only the planned postponement of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue Extension (RDY00004) does not qualify as a project exempt from the requirement to demonstrate conformity per the exempt project types listed in 40 CFR §93.126, Table 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 #3, 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 will meet to review the contents of the Draft Conformity Determination report, including the review of the most recent monitor data statistics characterizing the Anchorage CO and Eagle River PM10 Limited Maintenance Areas, which is appropriate to update the conformity for the 2019-2022 TIP Amendment #3.

MR. JONGENELEN briefed the Committee on the above-noted amendment.

MR. STICHICK informed the Committee that the Interagency Consultation Team met and supported the adequacy of the Draft Conformity Determination report.

In response to Mr. Vanhove's question if the Air Quality Conformity Determination is required just for TIP amendments or also for administrative modifications, MR.

JONGENELEN replied just for TIP amendments. He clarified that TIP amendments tend to be for adding or deleting a project with an updated air quality, or if there is a cost threshold (50 percent) of the total project cost that is being added or subtracted. That bumps it from an administrative modification to an amendment and requires a conformity determination.

CHAIR COY asked for clarification that it was the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue extension that triggered this?

MR. JONGENELEN believed all of them do, but there is a non-exempt project, which is the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. change requiring it to have more work done.

MR. STICHICK noted that is correct. Some classifications of projects are exempt from a conformity determination, such as studies, roadway rehabilitation or repavements, and safety analyses. He referred to Amendment #1 that had one potential project requiring a new conformity determination noting that we pulled it and moved it to Amendment #2, Academy/Vanguard Drive traffic improvements. It is possible for an amendment to not need an Air Quality Conformity Determination, but that is what the Interagency Consultation Team decides, along with the adequacy of any demonstration this requires.

In response to Mr. Vanhove's question if there is a list of exempt projects available, MR. STICHICK replied, yes, there is a list in 40 § CFR 93.126, Table 2 (Code of Federal Regulations).

MR. JONGENELEN clarified for Chair Coy that there are a couple of projects that trigger a TIP amendment, but this project triggers the Air Quality Conformity Determination itself.

There were no public comments.

MS. HEIL moved to recommend to the Policy Committee release for a 30-day public comment period the Air Quality Conformity Analysis for Amendment #3. MR. VANHOVE seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

b. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment #3 Release for 30-day Public Comment Period

BACKGROUND:

An amendment to the AMATS 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is needed to update Table 2 – Roadway; Table 4 - Plans and Studies; Table 5 - Congestion Mitigation Air Quality; and Table 10 – Transit. The updates are listed below.

Table 2 – Roadway

- Update Table 2 to add \$2.0M for design funding in FY2022 for project RDY00003 - Spenard Road Rehabilitation; move \$2.0M in design funding in FY2022 for project RDY00004 - Dr. Martin Luther King Jr Avenue Extension to Beyond FY2022; move \$1.25M in design funding in FY2022 - Potter Drive Rehabilitation for project RDY00007 to Beyond FY2022; and move \$4.125M in design funding in FY2022 for project RDY00008 - Transportation Demand Management Projects to beyond FY2022.

Table 4 – Plans and Studies

- Update Table 4 to add \$150K CRRSA funding for project PLN00006 - 92nd Avenue Extension Reconnaissance Study in FY2022. This funding is outside the AMATS allocation and will not impact fiscal constraint.

Table 5 – Congestion Mitigation Air Quality

- Update Table 5 to add \$1.495M to project #CMQ00005 in FY2022 and add \$3.879M to project CMQ00007 - Capital Vehicles in FY2022.

Table 10 – Transit

- Update Table 10 to update Beyond 2022 funding for project #19658 - Preventative Maintenance (5307), to reflect the correct amount; add \$4.785M to project #19634 - Track Rehabilitation (5307) in FY2020; add \$700K to project #31091 - Radio and Communication System (5307) in FY2020; add \$1.475M to project #19635 - Bridge Rehabilitation in FY2020; add \$3.0M to project #19635 - Bridge Rehabilitation in Beyond 2022; add \$285K to project #33245 - Facility Rehabilitation (5307) in FY2020; add \$300K to project #19634 - Track Rehabilitation (5337) in Beyond 2022; and add project numbers to Signal and Detector System (5307) and Facility Rehabilitation (5307).

MR. JONGENELEN explained the details of TIP Amendment #3. He noted that the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) study is close to getting underway, but a

consultant is not on board yet. This is also required to go before the Assembly for review and will do so during the 30-day public comment period.

CHAIR COY asked for public comments.

WOLFGANG JUNGE had the following questions and comments with responses noted in *Italic*.

(WJ) Was that the UMED TDM study and was it pushed out to 2023?

(AJ) *Yes, that was the UMED TDM. The only thing currently being pushed out is the construction of projects from that TDM study. The TDM study, itself, has already received funding and we are awaiting approval to bring a consultant on board to do the actual study.*

(WJ) If the Governor's bond package goes through and that project is funded, is your intent to not proceed with that TDM study?

(AJ) *The intent is to continue with the study, unless the Policy Committee determines otherwise, but we would need to know that now prior to getting a consultant on board.*

(WJ) DOT&PF had a PEL (Planning Environmental Linkages) study planned for the Seward Highway (south of Anchorage), but the Governor then directed us to reconstruct that portion of the highway, so the PEL study became irrelevant at that point. If the GO (General Obligation) Bond plays out this fall and the TDM study (which is close to validating something that action was just taken on), he did not know if money would be spent on that.

(AJ) *If the extension project (the actual roadway construction project) gets funding and goes forward, it would not invalidate the TDM study itself. The TDM study is looking at alternative ways to help with congestion in the area and can include roadway projects, or it can be alternative options. What is good about the study is that it can bring forward other projects that can be done in addition to the roadway. He would recommend continuing moving forward with the study because there is value in it. It can help with ideas like encouraging more carpooling in the area, or teleworking, or parking pricing, etcetera.*

(WJ) Agreed, but his understanding is that this is the second TDM study.

(CL) A TDM study had not been done in that area, but there was a State Capital grant for road construction, which went away. The TDM is considered in addition. He asked if the RFP (Request for Proposals) had gone out yet.

(AJ) *We are currently in negotiations regarding the RFP.*

(CL) *The RFP has gone out but has not been signed yet. He believed Mr. Jongenelen to be correct that there is value in the TDM study as a standalone project whether there is a new facility going through there or not because it does address other things, such as parking and transit. It is still the Policy Committee's decision though.*

(WJ) What was the dollar value?

(AJ) \$500,000 but with the ICAP (Indirect Cost Allocation Plan) it is within the \$400,000 range.

MR. VANHOVE moved to recommend to the Policy Committee release of the 2019-22 TIP Amendment #3 for a 30-day public comment period. MR. LYON seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

c. Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) 2050

BACKGROUND:

Anchorage Metropolitan Area Transportation Solutions (AMATS), the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Anchorage Bowl and Chugiak-Eagle River, is updating its Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). The MTP is the primary tool AMATS uses to plan for transportation needs within the AMATS area and recommend solutions based on anticipated funding availability over a minimum 20-year horizon. The MTP is federally required to be updated every four years and applies to all modes of transportation, addresses congestion management and air quality standards, and is based on current and planned land use.

MR. JONGENELEN briefed the Committee on the MTP 2050 update.

Project consultants, VAN LE, BEN COLEMAN, and TARYN OLESON-YELLE with R&M Consultants, presented the Performance Measures and Project Criteria and responded to questions.

1. Performance Measures – Release for 30-day Public Comment Period

Goals and Objectives for the 2050 MTP have been developed and refined based on public input. To support those goals and objectives, performance measures have been drafted. Performance measures aim to make all objectives measurable, allowing progress and performance to be tracked over time. Specific targets for these performance measures will be determined following performance measure approval, and the determination of who, when, and how often applicable data will be collected and reported has been established.

MR. COLEMAN provided a PowerPoint Presentation.

There were no comments.

2. Project Criteria – Release for 30-day Public Comment Period

The main component of the 2050 MTP is a fiscally constrained list of recommended transportation projects for the AMATS area. To develop that final list, projects must be identified, analyzed, and prioritized based on need, anticipated outcome, and fiscal constraints. The public and agency stakeholders will provide AMATS with conceptual projects

they would like to see in the AMATS area between now and 2050 (coming this spring). Those projects will be evaluated using the draft Project Prioritization Criteria.

MR. COLEMAN provided a PowerPoint Presentation.

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

- (BC) Referred to Goal 1 - Improves Existing Surface Transportation Infrastructure Condition noting that with regard to the land use and transportation interaction, what he recalled from the 2040 Land Use Plan is the concept of transit corridors. The value along those transit corridors is emphasizing pedestrian access and transit frequency, not just whether there is a transit route but if there are high-frequency transit routes. Looking through these metrics, he did not see discussion about transit corridors. It seems to him that, for example, on MTP Goal 1 the Transit Project Table that reads, "Project improves the condition of transit-supporting infrastructure" is somewhat similar to the table that when on a freight route there are actually points. In counting some of these that are transit and if they are on a transit corridor, then there will be extra points. This should emphasize the fact that developing high-quality transit on transit corridors has additional benefits versus other parts of the city.
- (JA) She echoed Chair Coy's comment in the sense of the additional support for supported corridors, especially with the amount of work that has gone into the Land Use Plan Map and our Short-Range Plan, and the way that we have redeveloped our system.
- (B. Coleman) There are two ways we can address this. We can either have, for example, plus twelve plus eight plus zero, so +12 would say, "It improves transit-supporting infrastructure on those corridors identified in the Land Use Plan or on some sort of transit-supporting corridors", and the second way would say, "On a lower frequency route". Or we could do it as bonus points. That is if we are just looking at transit projects. Goal 4, Incorporates Land Use Context, talks about improving non-motorized or transit access and growth supporting feature overlays, and these are described in the 2040 Land Use Plan specifically, and would include that transit-supportive development as well.*
- (BC) Liked the tiered option mentioned in Goal 3, Improves Transit Access and Accommodations - Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects. He thinks it is good to have a little bit of that tiered in the transit project. On the streets and others, it is particularly important to have that given that transit corridors, in his view, should have great transit facilities. We cannot have phenomenal frequency of transit everywhere in the city as it is just not feasible. If we can have it on transit corridors, he would see it as being a big benefit. Incorporate that into the higher point criteria.
- (B. Coleman) In the interest of avoiding double-counting, we definitely want to capture that importance. It might make sense to pick and choose, so for the bike and*

pedestrian and the corridor, specifically, maybe we could fit something in here as a bonus point or several bonus points, or when incorporating land use this is kind of where it fits in terms of improves transit access.

- (AJ) *He would prefer to have more specific comments because he is concerned that we are double counting things for one particular mode over another. He is supportive of transit, but it is a little odd that we are adding in here to multiple criteria when we already have it as its own separate criteria later on that is supposed to be on growth supported features. It is not just the transit corridors that we have to think about it, it is also the greenway development corridor, the RFAs, etcetera. The problem is that we have the incorporate land use aspect of it that already talks about those growth supporting features, so if we add it somewhere else, we are now giving extra points to that one particular item. Maybe we can make this more specific or different and make it stronger with more points, but he would rather keep it to this one focus, which keeps it equal for everyone. There are so many gross supported features that it is hard for us to list them in the criteria itself resulting in being overlapped or missed.*
- (B. Coleman) *Asked Chair Coy for an example of a situation where this would fail to address exactly what he is thinking of.*
- (BC) If there is a transit project proposed on a transit corridor versus on a parallel route that is not identified as a transit corridor, will there be a clear way that says this is not a supported transit corridor with it being just a growth supported feature overlay? Maybe there are other overlays that one of them accounts for but not transit. At least have one spot where it is clearly identified as not being a transit corridor. Not trying to double count too much, but having it one other place, maybe adjust Goal 3 with having extra points for it being on a transit corridor, so that at least when doing the scoring, it is identified.
- (AJ) *We can look at that. Just as a reminder, we will see these again as this is not final approval, just public release. Even during the 30-day public comment period we can all get together to discuss any comments or questions.*
- (BC) Referred to Goal 4 - Support Major Employment and Commercial Areas noting that one idea he had is to adjust the +5 under Corridor Project to say, "Project enhances bicycle/pedestrian/transit connections to adjacent land uses within major employment or commercial areas" and focus more on whether a certain development area is pedestrian friendly, and people want to stay there and can walk from their office across the street to have lunch, and has the amenities that are accommodating to those travelling modes staying within a major employment and commercial area, not just access to, which kind of has the feel of having a bike route to the location.
- (B. Coleman) *Clarified that it would be moving to there and moving within there.*
- (BC) Referred to Goal 6 - Provides Mobility Benefits to EJ Populations noting that one idea he liked is more about accessibility to those desired destinations. Often when you think about mobility, you think of transportation delay. With

some metrics, can we look at more interplay with land use and see where the desired designation is and is it improving mobility to those destinations? Not just mobility overall but thinking more about destinations.

(B. Coleman) We could split this into two and keep some of the general mobility and have something else because we are already talking about major employment destination connectivity. It would be easy enough to add that nuance either as a separate criteria or work that into here as well.

There were no public comments.

MR. LYON moved to recommend to the Policy Committee release of the Performance Measures for a 30-day public comment period. MR. VANHOVE seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

MR. LYON moved to recommend to the Policy Committee release of the Project Criteria for a 30-day public comment period. MR. STICHICK seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

d. Northern Lights Sidewalk Project – DOT&PF

BACKGROUND:

The AMATS 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) #NMO00008 Anchorage Areawide Pathway and Trails Pavement Replacement program is intended to fund projects listed in Table 7, that replace pavement for pathways/trails throughout the AMATS area. This program is like #RDY00012 - Pavement Replacement Program for roadways noted in Table 2. These programs are intended to fund smaller dollar pavement replacement projects, but some projects will require more funding than what the program was intended to cover. In the past, projects from #RDY0012 that exceeded this amount were pulled out of the program and put into the TIP as a separate project. This keeps the Pavement Replacement Program within the funding percentages outlined in AMATS' Policies and Procedures. The Northern Lights Boulevard – Minnesota Drive to Seward Highway is one such project.

As outlined in the DOT&PF memorandum, this project can provide significant improvements to the non-motorized users along this corridor but needs more funding. The amount needed, even at the preliminary planning level estimate, will exceed the amount typically used for sidewalk/pathway Pavement Replacement Program projects. To ensure it receives the full amount of funding needed, it is recommended that this project be made a standalone project in the 2023-2026 TIP and receive the full amount of funding listed in the DOT&PF memorandum.

MR. JONGENELEN briefed the Committee on the project.

SEAN BASKI with DOT&PF provided a presentation and responded to questions.

MR. LYON commented that this is a good example of what often times happens in these pavement replacement projects...we get Scope Creek. This is a great way to not have Scope Creek and to move it over into a standalone project and do it correctly as a full project. He is very supportive of this. It is a great way to enhance the non-motorized facilities in that corridor, which is obviously a huge need.

In response to Chair Coy if it will be scored with the other TIP projects, MR. JONGENELEN replied, no, and explained that because it has already received funding, it will be grandfathered in. Grandfathered does not guarantee it will be in there. It is a recommendation to the Policy Committee that will be included. It does not need to be scored. The Policy Committee can see what kind of funding is available after all the grandfathered projects and determine if it matches up to what they desire.

CHAIR COY mentioned regarding Northern Lights Boulevard and the MTP, that he recalled hearing there might be projects, such as bike lanes. How might that interplay with this sort of project since these are just sidewalks and curbs will be left where they are?

MR. JONGENELEN noted that it will not be widening sidewalks. It will be making ADA (American Disabilities Act) improvements where needed and assisting with moving or undergrounding utilities.

MR. BASKI added that the project takes the existing sidewalk width and makes it ADA compliant. Nearly all the driveways are not ADA compliant from full curb height down to no curb height. We would have to go onto every single private property to rework driveway grades. Most of the curb ramps at each of the signal light intersections are good because we reworked them with a pavement preservation project several years ago. Having large cracks in the sidewalks and overhead utility poles and junction boxes in middle of the pathway are not ADA compliant.

CHAIR COY asked if an MTP identified projects that made changes to where curbs might be and if having this project that is not changing curbs would interplay alright.

MR. JONGENELEN replied, no, these are very specific projects of what we can and cannot do. We do have projects in the MTP that are making recommended changes to Northern Lights Boulevard, but that is a separate project. This is a very specific and much needed improvement for non-motorized facilities. It does not preclude future projects from coming along and he would hate to see these improvements delayed or not done just for possible future projects that could be done. This can be done, and future projects can also be done.

There were no public comments.

MR. VANHOVE moved to recommend to the Policy Committee that this project be considered as a standalone, fully funded, non-motorized project. MR. KOHLHASE seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

6. PROJECT AND PLAN UPDATES

a. Highway Safety Corridors within an Urban Environment – DOT&PF

SCOTT THOMAS with DOT&PF provided a PowerPoint Presentation.

MR. KOHLHASE commented that he was aware of the Assembly's interest in this but was not aware if the Administration had considered it. It would be good for Chair Coy and himself to raise this with Lance Wilber, Public Works Director, and others before we get too much momentum behind it to ensure there is interest and support in doing something like this.

MR. THOMAS expressed that staff does not have the tools to go forward with making technical changes without local consultation or Municipal support.

CHAIR COY asked for public comments.

JOHN WEDDLETON asked if the Hillside is rural. He also requested a copy of the PowerPoint Presentation be sent to him.

JON CECIL replied that the Hillside is rural according to the Hillside District Plan.

MR. JONGENELEN offered to coordinate offline with Mr. Weddleton regarding scheduling a work session with Assembly members. It will still go before the Policy Committee.

7. GENERAL INFORMATION - None

8. COMMITTEE COMMENTS - None

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

10. ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 3:53 p.m.