

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

**November 9, 2023
2:30 PM**

This meeting was conducted solely via Microsoft Teams due to significant weather conditions.

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

Technical Advisory Committee Members Present:

Name	Representing
Brad Coy (Chair)	MOA/Traffic Engineering Department
Kate Dueber	Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)
Ben White	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF), Anchorage Field Office
Luke Bowland	DOT&PF
Jamie Acton	MOA/Public Transportation Department (PTD)
Craig Lyon	MOA/Planning Department
Steve Ribuffo	MOA/Port of Alaska
Adeyemi Alimi	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)
Melinda Kohlhaas	MOA/Project Management & Engineering (PM&E)
Steve Rafuse	MOA/Parks & Recreation Department

Also in attendance:

Name	Representing
Aaron Jongenelen	AMATS
Christine Schuette	AMATS
Chelsea Ward-Waller	AMATS
Jon Cecil	AMATS
James Starzec	DOT&PF
Daniel Volland*	MOA/Municipal Assembly
Van Le	R&M Consultants
Will Taygan	Chugach Mountain Bike Riders
Karen Pletnikoff	Turnagain Community Council Vice President
Lindsey Hajduk	NeighborWorks Alaska
Kevin Cross*	MOA/Municipal Assembly
Matthew Martino	MOA/PTD

**Policy Committee Member*

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

CHAIR COY called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. Ms. Dueber represented the Alaska Railroad Corporation on behalf of Brian Lindamood. Matt Stichick with MOA Anchorage Health Department was absent. A quorum was established prior to the arrival of Mr. Rafuse at 2:37 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.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – September 14, 2023

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

Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

a. Draft 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Planning (MTP) Public Comments

MS. WARD-WALLER noted that AMATS held a 60-day public comment period for the draft 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) from August 10 to October 9, 2023. During the public comment period, staff held three open houses (virtual, Anchorage, and Eagle River) and provided eight additional public presentations. AMATS received 1,244 comments from 202 individuals/organizations (including anonymous commentors). The Policy Committee and Technical Advisory Committee held a joint work session on October 30, 2023. The proposed changes (based on the public comment period and the joint work session) are before the TAC today for review and recommendation to the Policy Committee.

The Committee clarified that the TAC is being asked to forward any additional recommended changes to the Policy Committee and not just forward staff's proposed changes.

CHAIR COY opened the floor to public comments.

DANIEL VOLLAND, MOA/Municipal Assembly

WILL TAYGAN, Chugach Mountain Bike Riders

KAREN PLETNIKOFF, Turnagain Community Council Vice President

MR. LYON moved to forward the draft MTP to the Policy Committee as is without any changes. MR. BOWLAND seconded.

MS. KOHLHAAS suggested adding to the removals list the downtown engineering study for the 5th and 6th Avenue project with the knowledge that an engineering study beginning soon that will look at an analysis and the modeling of different scenarios reverting those streets to two-way travel. She would also like to add the estimated project dollar amount to this list when forwarding it to the Policy Committee.

CHAIR COY would not support removing the study because 5th and 6th Avenues have aging traffic signal equipment that have a critical need to be replaced, even if it does not go two-way. It is probably enough in the order of magnitude of the cost that regardless of where the engineering study goes, he felt it is an important project to have in there. It is of sufficient importance that he would not want it to not be in the MTP, then have to go through the process of figuring out later what we should take out of the funding constraint to be able to get it back in.

The Committee commented on the following projects.

Additions:

1. *Add project NMO198 – Glenn Highway Pathway – Settlers Drive to Knik River Bridge*

MR. BOWLAND noted that this looks like a good project and addition. He questioned where the funding sources were coming from.

MS. WARD-WALLER replied that all non-motorized projects are under the same funding source, which is AMATS.

2. *Add and combine projects NMO202 – Glenn Highway Pathway Connection at Artillery Road and CPS047 – Artillery Road Interchange Reconstruction*

MS. KOHLHAAS supported the project. She had been working on the design work with DOWL Engineering, and PTS is managing projects there, and we just realized the interchange work is a core project that really needs to take place before several other surrounding projects get constructed.

MR. BOWLAND supported the project. The planning efforts the MOA has been working on (that DOT&PF has also been involved with) have shown some good improvement options for what could be done in this area, so it would be nice to see this project included in the MTP and have the opportunity to advance. One item discussed during the work session was this likely being a STIP-funded project given the magnitude of what we would be looking at here for an interchange project. It would likely fall under DOT&PF funding constraints. Also,

looking at taking some of the funding from O'Malley to Dimond, as we are reevaluating the scope of that project, would be a way to advance Artillery Road while still within the fiscal constraint assumptions we are using for the MTP.

MR. RAFUSE also supported the project, noting that it made sense to combine the two projects. He recognized all the comments from Eagle River residents for helping to elevate this.

CHAIR COY supported the project and reiterated that even though this project did not score well, scoring criteria is a tool that helps us make better decisions.

MR. WHITE added that DOT&PF does support this project. Since it did receive several comments during the draft STIP review, there has been some internal effort to get this into the draft 2024-2027 STIP, but he was not exactly sure where in the process it was currently, since the comments are still being responded to.

MR. BOWLAND mentioned that it was discussed during the work session about possibly reevaluating the scoring criteria to see if anything might have been missed as staff was under some time constraints. He commended staff for doing an excellent job of boiling down all the discussion (during the work session) into a document that this committee can take action on.

3. Add project CPS193 Turnagain Street – 35th/McRae Avenue to Northern Lights Boulevard

MS. KOHLHAAS noted that PM&E had a design study report prepared, and it was really difficult for them to advance this project using bond funds. There are many right-of-way issues, and it will be a challenge, even if it goes into an AMATS project, to look at a complete street scenario without major impacts to acquisitions. However, she supported this one moving forward into the MTP and was also pleased to hear the support from the public today.

4. Add reference to UMED Travel Demand Management Study and Implementation

There were no comments.

5. Add Port of Alaska Tract-J Access Road (project description from the draft 2024-2027 STIP: The Tract-J project supports the Port of Alaska and aims to construct a new, high-standard access road that can better accommodate heavy truck traffic. The new access road, designed as an alternative to Ocean Dock Road, will enhance access to port facilities. The project also includes necessary improvements to drainage and roadway lighting).

MR. RIBUFFO expressed appreciation to Mr. Jongenelen and Ms. Ward-Waller for including this project description because he believed this was the first time the Port had ever had a project considered for inclusion in the MTP. Part of the reason why it was at the suggestion of the AKDOT Commissioner was because DOT&PF are looking at this, which was originally slated to be an emergency ingress/egress should something happen with the normal

ingress/egress into the Port. A project necessary before the larger Ocean Dock Road and Rail Realignment project that was to take place at the bottom of the hill and taking the normal access into the Port out of commission for almost two years. There needed to be another way to consider getting traffic either into or out of the Port or both, so that is how it found its way here. The TAC will take favorable consideration, and the Policy Committee will do what they see fit.

MS. KOHLHAAS wondered if something similar to proposed change #2 could be applied to this.

MR. WHITE explained that the Tract J project is currently in the draft 2024-2027 STIP that was out for public comment and DOT&PF is working on it right now, but it has not yet been approved by FHWA or FTA.

MR. JONGENELEN clarified that the STIP has to reflect the MTP, not vice versa. If a project is to be added to or remain included in the STIP, it needs to be in the MTP. These additions, removals, and changes are staff's way to help (based on feedback from our partners) the public get us to that point of having a set MTP, then the STIP can reflect what we have in our MTP. If the Seward Highway project is removed from the MTP, it has to be removed from the STIP.

Removals:

As a starting point for maintaining fiscal constraint after adding projects, these projects received three or more comments requesting removal:

1. *TIP NHS 1 - Seward Highway O'Malley Road to Dimond Boulevard Reconstruction, Phase II*

MR. BOWLAND noted that DOT&PF received a tremendous amount of input as this project has moved along in the process, and we are currently working on reevaluating the scope of this project as there are a lot of needs in this area. He thought a lot of good that aligned with the comments seen in the STIP is the desire for non-motorized, a bike path and a sidewalk on Brayton with non-motorized connectivity from east to west, currently in the form of a 92nd complete street type configuration, but open to consideration on what that looks like. There are trail connections in the O'Malley area. There is repaving of pathways in this area and a tremendous amount of traffic that goes through this area, which is being looked at to make sure we are accommodating in the best and safest manner that we can. With this being a STIP project and under STIP constraints, he did not see the benefit of removing it as we continue to discuss what the ultimate configuration and scope of this project is.

MS. KOHLHAAS has very little involvement or knowledge of the project, but understood that the process is underway and DOT&PF has a full public involvement process while looking at all the options available. She would support keeping the project in place so that DOT&PF can fully explore it.

MR WHITE reiterated that if the funding is dropped, the funding is not necessarily programmed or allocated to Anchorage or AMATS, not even the central region of DOT&PF. Once that funding is dropped out of the system, it goes back in and could be applied to the NHS in a lot of different places. DOT&PF's planning and STIP team are working hard to get our STIP into fiscal constraint as well. There are a lot of needs and challenges pulling at us from a lot of locations, so reducing the funding here opens it up to funding that becomes available to the department on our NHS throughout the state.

CHAIR COY asked that if this is for removal now, does the Committee's recommendation to move it into a change and having it be a substantial change to where the funding and what the project entails is substantially changed, the way to maintain fiscal restraint in this project?

MR. BOWLAND replied that the fiscal constraint within the STIP is managed by DOT&PF, so identifying this in the MTP allows us to show that there are needs that need to be addressed in this area at a high level. Spinning off some of the funding here and justifying or validating the needs in the Artillery area allows both projects to move forward and then puts it on DOT&PF as to how this fits into the funding plan. Along the same lines, one of the public comments heard was the desire to move the funding from the O'Malley to Dimond project to improvements in the Seward to Glenn PEL study area. What he heard from staff during the work session was that we already have funding needs along the Ingra/Gambell Corridor area that could be used to advance projects associated with the PEL, so he did not think there was a need to take this money from this project and allocate it to that project as that need can already be addressed with what is shown in the MTP.

2. STIP 1 - Seward Highway at 36th Avenue Interchange

MR. BOWLAND explained that, similar to the O'Malley-Dimond project, this project is funded by DOT&PF, within its fiscal constraints and is still early in the process, and was within the study area of the Midtown Congestion Relief project. There are some good benefits to pursuing a project in this area, but one of the challenges is that the Seward Highway is somewhat of a barrier to people trying to go east/west there, so DOT&PF is looking at ways where not only can we improve vehicular movements in that area, but have non-motorized facilities that will help allow people to go east, west, north, and south. Discussions with the MOA have been initiated with the context sensitive solutions, and a great deal of public involvement will take place during the environmental NEPA process, and a lot of outreach has already taken place with community councils with more to come. He is recommending this project remain in the MTP given the needs and improvements that can be made in the area.

3. STIP 2 - Seward Highway: Rabbit Creek Road to Girdwood Planning Environmental Linkage Study

MR. BOWLAND noted that this project was included in the previous draft STIP and has been removed as there is a desire to look at and study that whole corridor area, so he had no opposition removing it from the MTP.

4. TIP NHS 3 - Seward Highway Mile Post 98.5 to 118 Bird Flats to Rabbit Creek

MR. BOWLAND noted that this is a DOT&PF project (funded by DOT&PF) in trying to address the safety corridor along the Seward Highway that we have been looking at the different needs in that area through the Windy Corner project, expanding that to Rainbow, and ultimately expanding that whole project to look at a holistic approach improving safety along this highway corridor. The environmental process is underway, and public meetings have been scheduled for December 5-7, 2023, in Anchorage, Indian, and Girdwood. The stakeholder and working group have also been very productive. He is hoping to keep this project in the MTP and will continue to look at how that section of highway can be made safer.

CHAIR COY mentioned that with regard to Anchorage's needs and the safety corridor, and given that they drive that section of road fairly often, it does seem like the four-lane divided highway would be overkill. Would leaving that project in allow for more modest improvements, or what is the vision with possibly having a three-lane road with alternating passing lanes and a non-motorized pathway along the side? How would those considerations factor into whether this is in or out of the MTP?

MR. BOWLAND replied that while DOT&PF works through the environmental process, at the core of that process is evaluating alternatives and getting to a preferred alternative moving forward. Since DOT&PF is still in that process, it is a discussion that has yet to play out. He did not know if staff had any input on how this is worded in the MTP, but he would definitely say that there are needs in this area and this project should remain in the MTP as a project.

MS. WARD-WALLER clarified that the STIP project would reflect the description in the TIP or the STIP. She also clarified that the project descriptions (particularly for the longer-term projects) have a revised, shorter description. With regard to these projects, the description will reflect what AMATS has in the TIP.

5. TIP NHS 4 - Seward Highway and Tudor Road Interchange Reconstruction

MR. BOWLAND noted that this is another STIP project recently initiated and is early in the design stages, and DOT&PF is working to get a consultant on board for these design services. The Tudor Road bridge crossing over the Seward Highway was built in 1976 and is coming to the end of its expected design life. The bridge also has some clearance issues, being posted at 16 feet, which is lower than our standards. There are also some capacity issues with Tudor traffic, so we are hoping for opportunities for vehicular capacity upgrades. While looking at this project, we will consider multimodal and non-motorized, and making sure pedestrians, and bikers, and others have the opportunity to make it through that area in a better fashion after we complete the project.

CHAIR COY referred to what had been considered for 36th Avenue with regard to the Midtown Congestion Relief project, recalling that the Tudor interchange had some interplay with potential ramping and close spacing with 36th Avenue. If one of those goes and the other one doesn't, are there any implications, and how might that affect the other?

MR. BOWLAND replied that DOT&PF is definitely looking at that, and since these are both tracking roughly around the same, he thought that a lot more had been done on 36th Avenue with the PEL efforts. A bit of a head start took place on the 36th Avenue improvements, but these projects would have to interconnect with how they work together with individual utility to each one of these projects advancing.

6. TIP NHS 5 - Glenn Highway Incident Management Traffic Accommodations

MR. BOWLAND briefed the Committee on the Glenn Highway Incident Management Traffic Accommodations project, noting that DOT&PF began studying this after the big earthquake and looking at ways to improve the resiliency of the Glenn Highway and provide additional options in the event of a disaster bridge strike. There is a resurfacing project DOT&PF is working on from Airport Heights out to the Parks Highway, which will obviously be a phased effort with just keeping up with the ruts and pavement conditions. This is an effort that we are going to pair with and that we are looking at crossover opportunities within the median, so that, in the event there is a need to divert traffic in an emergency from one side of the highway to the other, you have more opportunities to do so. DOT&PF is also looking at ramp improvements in that area, so if you have to divert traffic up and over an off-ramp, that there might be a little bit more capacity there. He did see a great deal of need here; as you know, the Glenn Highway is the only road connection for Anchorage and the Kenai Peninsula.

MS. KOHLHAAS commented that this project sounds very important and surprising that it found its way on the removal list, but she guessed it had to do with all the public and review comments received.

Changes:

- 1. Change project description for TIP CS 11 – Eagle River Road Rehabilitation (Milepost 0.0 to 5.2, Old Glenn Highway to Oriedner Road) to explicitly include a separated multiuse pathway.*

There were no comments.

- 2. Change project description for CPS151 – Old Glenn Highway (Eagle River Loop Road to North Eagle River Access Road) to take out lane removal and add improved traffic calming and improved active transportation facilities.*

There were no comments.

3. *Change project descriptions if public comment maintains or supports original project intent and does not modify the project such that it would need to be rescored.*

MS. WARD-WALLER responded to Chair Coy's question as to what this means and what it would look like by explaining that this would be a very minor change in the project description, rather than something significant like adding a multiuse pathway.

For example, received requests to consider noise and impacts of the project.

4. *Goals and objectives: minor language changes that maintain existing intent. For example: Revise Objective 3G by changing "design and maintain" to instead say "design, construct, and maintain." We do not recommend changing intent nor adding new goals and objectives.*

There were no comments.

MR. BOWLAND moved to amend to strike removal items 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6. MS. KOHLHAAS seconded.

CHAIR COY asked for clarification that if these items are removed from the removal list so that they are no longer in the MTP, what are the implications for the fiscal constraint? Is it as simple as trusting DOT&PF, or allowing DOT&PF, or can DOT&PF find additional funding in their STIP; and it does not affect what we have here being added? What are the implications here?

MS. WARD-WALLER explained that other projects would need to come out. She added that these were listed because they had received the most public requests to be removed; otherwise, there was not a lot of consensus from public comments about which projects would get removed. If any of the larger projects under the additions section get added, that would change the dynamic, and they are not all DOT&PF projects either, so this is really a starting point. If the Policy Committee decides to move forward with any of these, they will need to determine what is coming out. In terms of the STIP, AMATS is looking at 27 years of funding, and it is just a different financial analysis.

MR. LYON asked for clarification that the Committee would be sending the MTP to the Policy Committee as written. If Mr. Bowland's amendment is accepted, then we would remove Project 3, which is the PEL. He did not know how much that was, but typically they are not a phenomenal amount, so that could be absorbed or moved around.

CHAIR COY believed Mr. Bowland's amendment was to take out, not remove from the removal segment, and basically delete from this document numbers 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6, so that it would only be #3. If he understood it correctly, it would be the only one listed as a removal. All of the rest of the removals would get taken out of this.

MR. LYON indicated that all the rest of the removals would stay in the MTP, and right now we have not added any projects. Ms. Ward-Waller or Mr. Jongenelen can share how much that PEL is, but that is not usually a whole lot of money.

CHAIR COY replied, yes, that makes sense.

MS. KOHLHAAS thought she had heard DOT&PF mention that they were considering reducing the amount for the project identified as #1. Could that be a change that shows \$105 million going down to a lesser amount and free up some money towards the added projects? She would like to have the project not be removed, but maybe there is a way to free up some money towards Artillery that could be identified with a change that finds some balance and ability to fund the Artillery Road Interchange project.

MR. LYON noted that the memorandum is requesting to add projects, remove projects, and make changes to others. He clarified that his motion was to forward the MTP as it is written without any changes whatsoever. Just forward it like the draft shows. So far, Mr. Bowland's amendment is to delete Project #3 -STIP #2 PEL.

MR. BOWLAND clarified that Mr. Lyon's description of his amendment is correct in that the change he is proposing is that this document would only show one removal, and that would be STIP 2: Seward Highway: Rabbit Creek Road to Girdwood Planning Environmental Linkage Study.

CHAIR COY restated that the Committee would not make any changes to the MTP, but would make changes to this document to only show the removal of #3 and Mr. Bowland's amendment is to strike numbers 1,2, 4, 5, and 6 from the removal section.

MR. BOWLAND replied, yes, that is correct.

MR. LYON further noted that the changes at the bottom of the Memorandum (1 through 4) are editorial and comments. There are some minor edits, which seem to be very good. If the Committee was willing, it would make sense to forward these to the Policy Committee as recommendations.

MS. WARD-WALLER noted that the motion is to forward the MTP and the amendment to the motion would be in addition to moving the MTP forward with the removal of that project from the MTP. The Committee does not need to be looking at editing the memorandum because there are still the top projects that have received comments for removal. That is just an objective from the comment response document, not a committee decision.

MR. LYON suggested that the cleanest, simplest way to do this in terms of the motion that is already on the table is for Mr. Bowland to remove his motion, and then vote on whether or not we think the MTP itself should be forwarded to the Policy Committee as is. Then we can do a second motion related to the memorandum, and it can be the ones we support. We could also say, "Let's remove" or "Removal of #3". In his opinion, all the changes are from numbers 1 through 4, and then it can be two separate motions acting on the memorandum, and then acting on the MTP.

MR. BOWLAND withdrew his amendment. MS. KOHLHAAS seconded.

MR. LYON withdrew his main motion. MR. BOWLAND seconded.

MR. LYON moved to recommend forwarding the memorandum to the Policy Committee with the removal of additions 1 through 5 and the removal of removals 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6. MR. BOWLAND seconded.

CHAIR COY restated that the motion by Mr. Lyon and seconded by Mr. Bowland was to forward this to the Policy Committee with the only thing on here being removal 3 and changes 1 through 4, and everything else would not be on this anymore.

MS. KOHLHAAS expressed that her highest interest regarding the additions is the Artillery Road Interchange. She was not sure if the motion was to remove items 1 through 5 in the additions.

MR. LYON clarified that his suggestion was not to have those forwarded to the Policy Committee partly because that is a lot of money that would be tied up and we would have to figure out all the projects coming in and out. He trusted the work done by staff in creating the document.

MS. KOHLHAAS commented that there is still the option allowing DOT&PF to look at all the same types of money funded projects and be able to strike a balance to get the Artillery Road into the MTP and have some ability to advance. She did hear there was some interest in maybe revisiting the Seward Highway project and maybe freeing up some constrained money to do that.

CHAIR COY expressed that he would really like to have this entire document go to the Policy Committee for them to look at. He did recognize the many things Mr. Bowland commented about the removals. He would also be interested to see if DOT&PF can put together their thoughts about how to keep these projects in the MTP that are listed in #'s 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6, and what their suggestion would be to keep in what we have in the additions, providing a clearer proposal to the Policy Committee for consideration before we take it out and before we make the changes that are in the current motion. He would prefer to see something different than what the motion is right now.

MR. RIBUFFO asked if the Committee is giving up the opportunity or are we just deferring to a later date the opportunity to reconcile this? If it is in the STIP, it has to be in the MTP? In other words, if we are removing all of these additions, we are ignoring that requirement, or are we just deferring to a later date and managing our way into that requirement? By not recommending any of these for addition, then we are taking them off the table for inclusion and they will be removed from the STIP?

MR. JONGENELEN replied that it depends on what the Policy Committee chooses to do because the memorandum before you will go forward to the PC with your recommendations, which is to not act on or not address #'s 1 through 5 in the additions and #'s 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6. Everything else you are recommending is changed as part of the MTP. The Policy Committee will see the entire memorandum along with what the TAC is recommending.

MR. BOWLAND commented that with regard to Ms. Kohlhaas' point, the TAC would send this memorandum, as is, and as a summary of the comments. We would support all the changes based on what we have on the table right now, which is supporting the removal of

Item #3. But in theory, we could amend the motion at hand to include any or all of the changes listed in this memorandum with a bit of guidance on how we would fund that or where that funding might come from. That would be up for discussion by the Policy Committee.

MR. JONGENELEN informed the Committee that they could amend the motion to add some of the additions, but would need to have information on how it is going to be funded.

MR. BOWLAND moved to amend to add recommended changes #2 and #5 to be funded by the removal of Item #3, and a portion of the funding from Seward Highway: O'Malley to Dimond.
MS. KOHLHAAS seconded.

First Amendment

Hearing no objections, the amendment passed.

MR. BOWLAND pointed out that his amendment focused on the STIP-funded additions we have on the list. He thought that Turnagain Street was the one that Ms. Kohlhaas was requesting, and the pathway on the Glenn has a lot of merit. He would be willing to entertain another amendment if someone knew where that funding would come from.

MS. KOHLHAAS moved to extend the meeting by 15 minutes. MR. ALIMI seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

MS. KOHLHAAS moved to amend to add a project or at least revise the Turnagain Street project as a Reconnaissance Study. MR. RIBUFFO seconded.

Second Amendment

Hearing no objections, the amendment passed.

Main Motion, As Amended

Hearing objections, CHAIR COY called for a roll call vote.

YAY

Mr. White

Ms. Kohlhaas

Mr. Ribuffo

Mr. Lyon

Ms. Acton

Mr. Bowland

Ms. Dueber

Mr. Alimi

NAY

Chair Coy

Mr. Rafuse

The motion passed, as amended 9 to 1.

6. PROJECT AND PLAN UPDATES

a. Public Transportation Department Agency Safety Plan

MATTHEW MARTINO with the MOA Public Transportation Department presented the safety plan.

There were no comments.

7. GENERAL INFORMATION - None

8. COMMITTEE COMMENTS - None

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS

WILL TAYGAN, Chugach Mountain Bike Riders, asked the committee to consider recommending a reduced #1 addition. The whole project was scored as a seven-mile project, but in order to connect to the community of Eklutna and Thunderbird Heights to the bike path that starts on the roads that start, it is only a half-mile section of trail that is missing for those youth to be able to access their schools and parks. If the committee would be willing to forward a reduced scope for that, he thought that would be fiscally responsible. That is extending the Glenn Highway pass.

CHAIR COY suggested Mr. Taygan take his comments to the Policy Committee, since the TAC had already acted on this.

10. ADJOURNMENT

MR. ALIM moved to adjourn. MR. BOWLAND seconded.

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.