

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

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

**May 19, 2022
2:30 PM**

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

Technical Advisory Committee Members Present:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Brad Coy (Chair)	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)
Jamie Acton	MOA/Public Transportation Department
Kent Kohlhasse	MOA/Project Management & Engineering (PM&E)
Shaina Kilcoyne	MOA/Energy and Sustainability

Also in attendance:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Aaron Jongenelen	MOA/Planning
Christine Schuette	MOA/Planning
John Pekar	Kinney Engineering
Sean Baski	DOT&PF
James Starzec	DOT&PF
Van Le	R&M Consultants
Mark Eisenman	DOT&PF
Robert Wertman	
Kathryn Wenger	Federal Highways Administration (FHWA)
Nancy Pease	

**Policy Committee Member*

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

CHAIR COY called the meeting to order at 2:31 p.m. Craig Lyon and Steve Ribuffo were excused. A quorum was established.

2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

AARON JONGENELEN encouraged public involvement in this meeting of the AMATS Policy Committee. He explained staff would first make their presentation, followed by any comments from Committee members, and the floor would then be open to public comment.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. LINDAMOOD moved to approve. MS. HEIL seconded.

Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – March 10, 2022 and April 14, 2022

MR. VANHOVE moved to approve. MR. LINDAMOOD seconded.

Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

**a. 2023-2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
Comment/Response Summary**

MR. JONGENELEN informed the Committee 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.

Public comments emailed to the Committee and staff immediately prior to the meeting were discussed.

The Committee opted to address the Comment/Response Summary page-by-page.

With regard to the summary pages, the following questions and comments were made by the Committee with responses noted in *Italic*.

PAGE 1

- (BC) What triggered the cost estimate adjustment to the 5th Avenue Signal and Lighting upgrade?

- (AJ) *This is two-fold. One is that we received comments from the public that we should not be adjusting the signals until we do more work downtown and do it all at once. There have been comments about changing 5th Avenue from a one way to a two-way with slower speeds. Secondly, when we looked at this further based on the nomination form, the nomination form did not have a lot of detailed information about these projects. We then realized the cost was going to be significantly higher than originally anticipated and that was part of our scoring discussion. Staff is recommending removing the 5th Avenue upgrades but are recommending keeping 3rd Avenue because it was a separate nomination form that did explain a lot of the requirements that would need to be done for that project, so we scored it based on that. It is a way to help keep the process transparent and is much easier to match what was nominated versus what is in the TIP and how this got into the TIP. Staff is recommending replacing the 5th Avenue Signal upgrades with three separate projects. Two are road upgrades/complete streets type projects that would do non-motorized improvements, lighting, drainage (where needed), ADA improvements for Lois Drive and 32nd Avenue, and Folker Street, which borders Tudor. We do have a non-motorized improvement for pedestrian facilities on Dale Street. PM&E recommended we make this a road upgrade versus just pedestrian improvements, but he did not feel comfortable making it a road upgrade because there was no basis, other than just discussing it internally, and it was not included in the nomination form that was only for pedestrian improvements.*
- (BC) Is that the only change from when we saw this TIP list previously and the updated TIP recommendations?
- (AJ) *In terms of project additions, yes, those three are the only additions or deletions. All other changes were fixing errors for road numbers or TIP Need Identification numbers. We added a new column to the TIP at the request of FHWA to show the responsible agency for the project. Additionally, we had others showing project estimates in the year of expenditure dollars, and a few minor errors throughout the document were corrected.*
- (BC) Were these three added new projects included in the TIP scoring criteria?
- (AJ) *Yes. Folker Street is the only one that scored slightly lower than the other two, but Lois Drive and Dale Street were in the higher end of the score. If we were going to move these 5th Avenue signals, we need to go back through the scores again that had been posted for everyone to see and look for some of the projects that we originally wanted to put in but did not have enough funding for. With a little more funding available now, we asked if there was a way for us to add in some of these projects that members of the public had been asking for, such as Complete Streets and non-motorized focused projects. Staff recommended these three projects based on the scores.*
- (BC) Looking at the south side of Dale Street by the parking lot, it is just kind of a free-for-all driveway area. Would a pedestrian improvement narrow those driveways or would a full street improvement address that?

- (AJ) *He, himself, is not a designer but based on what he had seen for other non-motorized improvements, the non-motorized improvements alone could change the configuration of that driveway because if you put a sidewalk or some type of pathway on either side, you could narrow it down to make it a single driveway. A lot of that would have to be determined at the project's design level. The roadway improvement was just something noted by the municipality as being needed at some point and felt that all the work should be done, if we were going to be out there. However, that is not how AMATS approaches things as we need to make sure that it is the original intent of the project with what was nominated, etcetera.*
- (CH) Somewhat disagreed with that. Someone nominates a project and the experts within the municipality look at that and make their best judgement and recommendation on what would be the best option in utilizing your funds. If you are going to go in and the road has to be fixed, the best thing to do is do it all at once. You do not want to complete an improvement and then come back later, when the main facility fails, and have to rip it all up just to put it in again because it was not done in the beginning. Coming back and having to re-score the projects because most of the nominators did not know all the details is the responsibility of these various groups to look at them wholistically and the timing to make sure we do not have projects that need to be redone later.
- (AJ) *Clarified that when we scored the project, we did not know it needed a complete road reconstruction. It was not until right before it was posted a week ago that he found out it could be more than just pedestrian improvements.*
- (CH) Then change the scoring in the list?
- (AJ) *We did not rescore it because there had not been enough time to gather the committees. Based on that, he did not feel comfortable making that change and he informed the Committee of it today because it can be included as part of the public process. If the Committee wants to upgrade this to a full roadwork project, then everyone is aware of it.*
- (BC) How much more money would be spent versus doing the projects together? Would adding the road affect the final number in the TIP and not make it financially constrained anymore?
- (AJ) *Another challenge is if you change the project cost, we will have to find where that funding comes from. At the design stage, it tends to be a little cheaper than the actual construction. The project cost goes from \$2M to \$6M total based on the municipality's estimate, so the design number would not go up that much. We could find the funding if there was a need for it.*
- (BC) If we are putting this as non-motorized (as recommended in the comments) and, through the design, it is determined that it would cost "X" amount to add the road, would that be because it is a project and, if it is in the TIP,

could that additional funding be allocated to it if it was available or moved to future TIPs? Does the fact that it is in the TIP allow some of that flexibility?

(AJ) *Deferred the question to DOT&PF as to how that works if you start a project as non-motorized and then you want to move it into a roadway project. What impacts would there be from the federal side? We would have to do an amendment to the Air Quality and more. Is there anything on the FHWA side that prevent us from basically upgrading it to a full road project?*

(TV) *It would be the same process requiring an amendment because you are changing the entire scope.*

Sean Baski *It depends on where you are in project development. The goal would be to define (similar to how we handled the Northern Lights pathway upgrades) what the overall scope of the project is relatively early before we advance too much. If you had gotten through the environmental document and decided you need to go back and redo the roadway work, then you would have to redo the entire environmental documents and start over and scrap a lot of the efforts you had done already. Again, the goal would be to define the scope early on. We would have to put in an amendment or a new project development agreement with FHWA, if we change the scope after we already had it approved by them.*

(CH) *It seems like it would be better to put it in as a slightly bigger scope and then it is easier to go down than it is to go up.*

Sean Baski *It certainly is. The one thing to caution is that if you put in too much scope, then you are expending efforts and energy and dollars in a direction that you may not actually construct.*

(AJ) *Recommended the project goes in as a full road.*

(TV) *Just based on this conversation, if you think you need to upgrade the road, his recommendation would be to put it in as a whole road and pedestrian project.*

(CH) *PM&E (Project Maintenance & Engineering) and the municipality's experts say that it needs to be done at some point.*

(MS) *Referred to Comment #26 regarding the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue Extension. Staff's response is that there is a possibility of DOT&PF closing out that project. Would that not pair well with shifting those dollars and efforts to the Dale Street design?*

(AJ) *The Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue Extension is already zeroed out in the TIP. There is no funding programmed meaning we would have to find it, but in looking at the Dale Street design work, we could easily add in more funding to get started and bring more in later, as needed. Initial design is anticipated*

starting in 2025 and the second hit will happen sometime in 2027, or later, so we could have more funding there. He did not see any reason this could not be upgraded to a full road project and add a few hundred thousand dollars more into the design efforts, and that could be taken from Pavement Replacement. It would do a lot of good for the community to have this a full road project.

(BC) When staff looked at projects to include, would there have been a different project, other than Dale Street, that you might have included with what was just now discussed with Dale Street being a full road project? Two of the three options are to either leave it as is (not as well-liked as making it a full road project) or having something different that we can replace it with.

(AJ) *He could not think of anything because of how high it ranked. Turning it into a full, narrow down the lanes road project or whatever we end up doing, would only make it score higher on the list because you are accounting for more of those different options that we look at as part of our criteria. Looking at Dale Street and the connections for the non-motorized are already waiting on either end, so that would be good. It is just that little extra for the road that would bump it up that much more. If the Committee wants to see if there is something else, we can look at the score sheet.*

MS. HEIL moved that Dale Street Non-Motorized Improvements go from a Non-Motorized Improvement to a Dale Street Road Improvement that would incorporate the whole look of all non-motorized and motorized improvements.

MS. HEIL asked for clarification if it would be classified as a reconstruction?

MR. JONGENELEN was not sure if it would be considered a rehabilitation or a reconstruction. We normally refer to it as an upgrade.

MS. HEIL revised her motion to read, "Dale Street Non-Motorized Improvements go from a Non-Motorized Improvement to a Dale Street Upgrade to incorporate the non-motorized improvements that have been nominated." MR. VANHOVE seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

PAGE 2 - NONE

PAGE 3 - NONE

PAGE 4

MR. JONGENELEN read a comment/request submitted by Nancy Pease.

(CH) What does the Land Use Plan have to do with infill and redevelopment?

(AJ) *He referred to staff's response on Comment #34 that addresses land use features that specifically focus on how AMATS can help with infill and*

redevelopment. They ran the criteria and may have a portion of our criteria for it and infill was strongly correlated with land use changes. AMATS can help support the transportation system but cannot actually do the land use infill changes themselves. We have projects that are in those supported corridors but did not identify those as one of the comments in the summary to change by listing which projects are Complete Streets, which fall within the Reinvestment Focus Area, which fall in the Transit Supported Development Corridors, and the Greenway Supported Development Corridors. Those key actions that the Land Use Plan calls for are what we can help with and are included in the criteria, and that is what these projects help do and can help with infill and redevelopment.

- (BC) With regard to the MTP process, what is the scenario tool that is being used? Will land use play into that to some degree?
- (AJ) *The tool is VisionEval, our strategic planning model. And, yes, we use a regular model, but this one is nimbler and is more focused on things like Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions, which is why he mentioned that we need to wait until that is completed and then figure out what our target is. It can look at things such as land use, land use changes, etcetera. Land use designations are up to the Municipality of Anchorage (MOA), so AMATS can make recommendations, but it is the MOA's decision to deviate from their 2040 Land Use Plan or make changes to it.*
- (CH) Is a list of recommendations for the next MTP update being created? She suggested the idea of a standing committee and that a Land Use Transportation Study be a recommendation for future discussions when there is more time and focus to look at it, and even adding a timeline that within one year after the submittal/approval of this MTP to have a recommendation of an outcome. Trying to slam it into this update does not make a lot of sense.
- (AJ) *We are going to try to incorporate the recommendations in this update. And, yes, we are making a list as we go along of anything that needs to be carried forward or watched for in the next update.*
- (BC) Can the MTP have a policy to do more with land use and transportation committees or other things? He is supportive of the transportation going hand-in-hand and being looked at more.
- (AJ) *We can add an action item asking what we want to do for this, or we can add a study into one of the recommended projects to do a land use transportation type of integration study to see if we can get recommendations on how to move forward. Being AMATS, we are our own group. It is not the Municipality of Anchorage, but it often gets confusing because of how integrated we are with certain things. It is something to analyze and is a recommendation to put in this MTP to begin the process and move forward. He would be interested in what other MPOs are doing and if they have their own committees regarding transportation land use. Many other MPOs are not under one local entity, so it may make it easier for us to do more integration work.*

PAGES 5 - 6

- (BC) A commenter suggested having something geolocated and the MTP seems like a good overall umbrella that could consider how to integrate all the comments.
- (AJ) *That is what is nice about the interactive map because it does get that geolocation aspect as well.*

PAGES 7 - 9

- (AJ) Read into the record a late comment received just prior to the meeting that states, "South Addition Community Council asked to amend the TIP to study and rebuild A and C Streets as complete streets. This would have a positive effect of raising property values in the underbuilt and even deteriorating R-3, but that amendment was dismissed in a number of ways as inappropriate." MR. JONGENELEN pointed out that a nomination was not submitted to study A and C Streets as complete streets. Both nominations submitted were reconstructing A and C Streets. Our response was that it had not been evaluated as part of the MTP model to see what impacts, both positive and negative, it has on the transportation system. Other similar projects have already been reviewed, such as Fireweed Lane Rehabilitation, both versions of Spenard Road Rehabilitation, and Northern Lights/Benson Lane Reduction (a study for this has been recommended). It is common for us to look at these projects in the model as a transportation system, as a whole, before we actually move forward. It is not out of line if the Committee would like to recommend a study, it is just not what was nominated. Staff is recommending forwarding this comment for review during the MTP process where we can look at what it would take to reconstruct or what impacts it would have on the network, as a whole, if that portion of A and C Streets were reconstructed. He believed it is lane reduction and sidewalk with increases.
- (CH) It would be more cost effective to do those model runs during the MTP rather than trying to guesstimate in a TIP.

PAGE 10

- (BC) His understanding, with regard to some of the projects identified in this TIP, is that full funding is not included because the projects are started in this TIP and additional funding in the next TIP will then kick in. A large percentage of the project would be in the next TIP, such that Eagle River – Chugiak area would get an overabundance of a higher percentage from their population. Not to justify that we are trying to hit a percentage.
- (AJ) *It could be the next TIP or the following TIP. You have to look at it as cycles where some areas receive highs and lows depending upon the years and the needs identified through our process and the scoring. In looking at the next*

few TIP cycles or the next TIP, if the Eagle River Road Rehabilitation is fully funded in that one, that is \$60M of the \$130M we get over those four years. That is 46% of the program for that one project alone., which is one of the reasons why we do not look at the percentage of funding when going through the different districts because of how federal projects are broken out over the years in the TIP.

- (CH) In response to FHWA's comments, she did not recommend changing the title of a State Implementation Plan (SIP) mandated project to "Transportation Control Measures Identified" because they are talking about the federally defined Transportation Control Measures (TCM) for which we really do not have any. Our public education is a committed SIP measure, but not a federally defined Transportation Control Measure. They are control measures to help maintain carbon monoxide reductions in our maintenance plan, but you have to look at what the federally defined Transportation Control Measures are. TCMs are really important because, in the conformity language, you have to show that the TIPs, the MTPs, and the federal funding are being spent in an area do not delay any implementation of Transportation Control Measures. FHWA does not really think about our mandated SIP control measures because it is an air quality issue.
- (AJ) We do recommend a change to this and will have to look into the SIP more. Maybe we could just say SIP Mandating Measures, instead of TCMs.

MS. HEIL moved to change the title to Control Measures identified in the State Implementation Plan and strike the word "transportation" and to change staff's recommendation to read, "Will identify which projects in Table 5 that are Transportation Control Measures with an asterisk. Those with asterisks are federally defined as a Transportation Control Measure". MR. BOWLAND seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

PAGE 11 - None

PAGES 12 - 14

- (CH) With regard to Comment #117, she suggested taking out the word "diesel" and replace it with "bus replacement" and not have it specific to the type of buses. If the infrastructure or grants find a way to update the bus barn in order to handle non-diesel engines, then you can do replacement buses without having to change the language at a later date.
- (JA) *There is a significant amount of study that needs to be done to access any of the new federal funds to be able to do alternative fuels, and we need to prepare for that as well.*

MS. HEIL moved to update the project list in Table 5.

(AJ) *Clarified that the table does not say diesel and has not for quite a while. We already looked at changing over to electric buses but that was already attempted and there were significant concerns, so it was taken out.*

(JA) *We do not call out diesel in Tables 5 or 9.*

(BC) Staff's response does say diesel.

(JA) *For the record, the bus buy we are currently in is a diesel replacement.*

MS. HEIL **withdrew** her motion.

CHAIR COY clarified that the language will remain as is.

(BC) Agreed that the comments from Ms. Pease are great ideas, but he did not know how we would integrate them into the TIP at this time. The MTP is a great opportunity to consider these.

(AJ) *We definitely need more research on some of them and now that we have seen the suggestions, he thinks it is something we can continue to look at and will include them as nominated projects for the MTP, since they are now on public record.*

PAGES 15 – 17 - None

PAGE 18 - None

PAGE 19 - None

MR. JONGENELEN pointed out a correction to be made to Project RDY00018, 3rd Avenue Signals and Lighting Upgrade. There was an error in the termini when putting the project into the draft TIP that was not noticed until after the Comment/Response Summary had been posted. The current termini are Cordova Street to Ingrid Street. What was nominated and needs to be documented in here is E Street to Cordova Street.

MR. KOHLHASE moved to change the termini in the 3rd Avenue Lighting project to read, "E Street to Cordova Street". MR. STICHICK seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

CHAIR COY opened the floor to public comments.

The following written comments were submitted via Microsoft Teams chat and read aloud by Mr. Jongeneelen:

NANCY PEASE - These are not new ideas. Comments 22, 45, 52, 64, and 74 were submitted over a month ago.

MR. JONGENELEN replied to her comment by explaining that he had looked at those comments and all, with the exception of Comment #22, have been responded to that we will move forward by either sending it to a project team for consideration or staff will look at it for future TIP criteria updates. Comment #22 talks about removing value-judgment language from the TIP submitted by Bike Anchorage, which staff thanked them for their comment and will do some additional analysis by looking at what other areas do to see if we can make some changes to the descriptions.

CHAIR COY indicated that he had heard from various commenters regarding improvements that some projects could be debated as to whether it is an improvement or not. Is this the time to make that change and do a whole scale and call them projects, instead of project improvements?

MR. STICHICK noted that the closer we can make the description to the actual intent of the project, the better. If it is a rehabilitation, then we say that. If it is a redesign, we say that.

MR. BOWLAND agreed with Mr. Stichick that the more descriptive we can be on the nature of the project improvements and is a bit of a catch-all that has been used historically.

MR. JONGENELEN stated that for the new descriptions put in for Lois Drive and Folker Street, we do not say improvements but use language such as upgrades, electric standards, lighting upgrades, addition of non-motorized facilities, or drainage upgrades. He did notice in the Eagle River Road Rehabilitation that we said ADA improvements, so maybe we can use ADA upgrades instead. He will work with DOT&PF and the MOA on what type of language works for descriptions to get the idea across of what we are doing. He will not have enough time to do this prior to having to post this information for the Policy Committee and is not sure if we can change this now or have to come back at a later date with an amendment to update all the descriptions after it has been approved. He clarified with Mr. Stichick that it is just a simple word change that can be made during the interagency consultation.

NANCY PEASE (2nd comment) - Upgrade is a synonym for improvements. The point is to list the main features and outcomes: wider lanes, shoulders, crossings, etcetera.

MR. JONGENELEN explained the problem is that we do not know that at this point. That has to be looked at when the design happens, so he cannot add those into the description.

CHAIR COY asked for clarification when saying upgrades, it is saying this is the standard for the road or path going from what is there to having it consistent with the standard. If it is just defined as an upgrade, there is some nuance.

MR. JONGENELEN thinks right now is not the best time because he needs to meet with DOT&PF and the MOA to discuss this further.

MR. STICHICK felt this could equally apply starting with the MTP.

The following is public testimony provided verbally via Microsoft Teams.

NANCY PEASE (3rd comment) – She wanted to mostly address the projects adding that time was not spent on her or Cheryl’s comments about the broken process, but you should be aware, and she hoped you read those portions of their letters. It is not just the two of us. She just wanted to read you one quick comment from the Comment/Response Summary to the goals and objectives submitted by a biker. He collected some language from one of the bike forums that said, “Many found that your focus was so misguided that it was not even worth their time. Some argued that it is, after all, your intent to so alienate the public that the public gives up because, as it has been the case all along, you do what you want no matter how many people die.” That is powerful language and that is the level of frustration in working within the AMATS public comment process and that the Assembly cannot have one week to put in public comments on this \$1.27B budget. On to the projects, specifically with the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Study, she did not catch all the testimony, but she is hoping you will put several hundred thousand dollars toward a study for a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan. Mr. Jongenele had said he could pull money from Pavement Replacement to fund the study for the Folker Street and 40th Drive studies, so if there is that kind of flexibility, then pull that money from somewhere and fund it. It is unconscionable that we do not have any approach or concrete actions toward Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reductions in this plan that goes till 2036. We have a 2040 goal at 50% reductions, and we cannot do it unless we start reforming our transportation system. She is asking for you to put money in this TIP and a date, like a one-year date. Secondly, same thing with the A and C Complete Streets idea. A study of pedestrian safety was nominated for the TIP just the way pedestrian safety was nominated for Folker Street. One of staff’s comments was that the Complete Streets was not nominated. If you can expand the Folker Street project, then you can expand this idea from A and C Streets. Someone said that pedestrian safety will expand to a Complete Streets study and pull the money from somewhere to get that going. Thirdly, it was said that releasing scoring sheets was not what we do at AMATS. She did not feel that was a very good explanation. There should not be a need to shield the scorers, but if there is, then just release them anonymously. This is a policy recommendation you can make that does not cost any money, so please do that. With the citizen real-time data collection, again, could you put a timeline and who is responsible for pursuing that, so we get some real action on that? The same thing with the biased language reform with timeline and who is going to report back.

MS. KILCOYNE noted that this is relevant but does not quite get to what Ms. Pease is asking for. We are finalizing a Greenhouse Gas inventory to be released within the next month. There is not a reduction plan to go with it, but it will help us get there because it shows where our emissions are coming from. It is a 2015 and a 2020.

In response to Ms. Heil’s question that since the report is not available yet, would it be better to put the plan request in as a project to the MTP, so that we can look at all the studies at once within the MTP framework and have that already out making it easier to inform, MR. JONGENELEN explained that whatever Ms. Kilcoyne can provide will help us bring it into the MTP. As Ms. Pease mentioned, we need methods and modeling to get this moving forward. That is what we are looking at for the MTP, but we actually need time to do it. He cannot say it will be here tomorrow because he does not know what it looks like without actually looking at it. We are moving forward with it but it will take time to get there.

CHAIR COY noted that Ms. Pease requested timelines and he asked if we are the right group to put timelines on those items?

MR. JONGENELEN replied, yes, but we need to determine there is enough staff time available to do this in addition to what we are doing.

MS. HEIL noted that is the reason why the MTP is the more appropriate vehicle than a TIP. The TIP is a short-range funding plan and the MTP is the long-range, full picture that has all the modeling, inputs, and looks at everything holistically. Some of these big picture items would fit better and allow more time to think things through rather than putting them in now.

MR. JONGENELEN added that the MTP has the funding, and the consultants are already on board to help us.

CHAIR COY would be interested, as we put together the projects in the MTP, in updating the terminology used.

MR. JONGENELEN pointed out that the 2050 MTP is being updated right now. We are not talking about delaying it.

MS. HEIL clarified that the two projects in Table 5 are Transportation Control Measures projects and to leave them as staff had proposed and **withdrew** her motion to change the language in Table 5. MR. BOWLAND **withdrew** his second.

There were no further comments.

MS. HEIL moved to forward the 2023-2026 TIP Comment/Response Summary and the Tables to the Policy Committee for review and approval, as amended. MS. ACTON seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

MR. STICHICK moved to reorder the agenda to hear Items 5.c. and 5.d. before Item 5.b. MS. HEIL seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

**c. 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment #3
Air Quality Conformity Determination**

MR. JONGENELEN stated that AMATS is the federally recognized Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), which is responsible for planning the transportation network within the Municipality of Anchorage. AMATS has proposed Amendment #3 to the 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to modify the fiscal programming schedule for three roadway projects, one Transportation Demand Management (TDM) 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.

There were no comments.

MR. STICHICK moved to recommend approval of the Air Quality Conformity Determination for TIP Amendment #3 to the Policy Committee. MS. HEIL seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

d. 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment #3

MR. JONGENELEN explained that an amendment to the AMATS 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is needed to update Table 2 – Roadway; Table 3 - Non-motorized; Table 4 - Plans and Studies; Table 5 - Congestion Mitigation Air Quality; Table 6 - Transportation Alternative Program; Table 10 – Transit; and Table 11 - Other Federal, State, and Local Funded Projects within the AMATS Area. The cold storage facility was not included in error, but it is in the TIP tables, and it will be updated immediately following the meeting. It is the last project in Table 11.

CHAIR COY asked for public comments.

The following written comment was submitted via Microsoft Teams chat and read aloud by Mr. Jongenelen:

NANCY PEASE – Although the TAC did not commit to any timelines as part of your draft TIP approval, she hoped you will set some dates for staff to respond to you on the issues of biased language and citizen real-time data collection, and she will hope you direct staff to make the TIP scoring sheets public. Even when there was a comment period for the draft TIP scoring criteria, AMATS did not share any trial runs to see how the criteria favored or penalized certain types of projects.

MR. STICHICK moved to approve Amendment #3, 2019-2022 TIP Tables to the Policy Committee for approval. MS. HEIL seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

MR. LINDAMOOD moved to postpone Items 5.b. and 5.e. to the June 9, 2022 meeting and go forward with hearing Item 6.a. MR. VANHOVE seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

b. Destination UMED Public Involvement Plan

e. 2023 Safety Targets

6. PROJECT AND PLAN UPDATES

a. Downtown Trails Connection Project Update

JOHN PEKAR with Kinney Engineering presented the project update.

b. AMATS Transportation Network – Model Presentation

This item will be heard June 9, 2022.

7. GENERAL INFORMATION

8. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS

10. ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 4:28 p.m.