



## Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

AMATS is in the process of developing the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). The following is a compilation of comments received from March 28-July 14, 2017. Please note- general comments will be addressed as part of the Alternatives Analysis. The next comment compilation is anticipated after public meeting #2.

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
28 Mar 2017	Carol Fink	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Thanks for sharing. I realize it's a potential list on page 8 but if you have any influence: Consider adding ASD, Anchorage Parks Foundation, AARP (many seniors don't drive) And Alaska Center for the Environment is now Alaska Center
29 Mar 2017	Jon Spring	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	The PIP appears to be comprehensive and should result in good public input.
29 Mar 2017	Jon Spring	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	It does not appear that the CAC will be asked to provide comment on the Financial Plan. The Financial Plan is a critical part of the MTP. It wouldn't hurt to have some feedback on whether or not the revenue assumptions are realistic. Also, the financial assumptions regarding the Knik Arm Crossing has, in the past, been the subject of considerable criticism. I think the CAC should have a review role at least.
29 Mar 2017	Jon Spring	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	It also does not appear that the CAC has a role in the review of the prioritization of projects to be included in the Plan. There are two aspects of this review: the criteria used to score the projects and the actual scoring results. I believe that at least one CAC member expressed an interest in reviewing the criteria.
29 Mar 2017	Jon Spring	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Note on page 7 of the PIP that the Planning and Zoning Commission also recommends approval of the MTP as an element of the Comprehensive Plan. It does not make a recommendation regarding AMATS adoption.
29 Mar 2017	Jon Spring	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	In the section of the PIP dealing with roles and input (pages 22-23), it appears that the CAC only has a review and consultation role. I think that the CAC should be charged with making a formal recommendation to the TAC and Policy Committee. It seems that, to this point in the evolution of the CAC's roles and responsibilities, AMATS has only asked for comments from individual members. The role of the CAC is diminished if not required to make a motion and vote on approval (like every other Committee that I have been on). The PIP should be revised to make it clear that the CAC will submit a formal recommendation for approval on the Final MTP.
29 Mar 2017	Jon Spring	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	How will AMATS deal with public involvement regarding the environmental justice analysis? Shouldn't there be some type of public notification at least or public meeting to present this information? Isn't that part of making sure that the public knows what the effect on minorities and low income will be?
1 Apr 2017	Cynthia Wentworth	General Comment	<p><b>From:</b> Cynthia Wentworth  <b>Sent:</b> Saturday, April 1, 2017 8:22 AM  <b>To:</b> Jan Bronson; Allen Kemplen; LaMarr Anderson; Lizzie Newell; Travis Montgomery; farnsworth Paul; kubitx James; Riki Lebman; John Roderick; Jessica Smith; Brad Sworts; Schawna Thoma; Susanne Fleek-Green; Bill Sheffield; Chris Rose; Ryan Schryver; David Greenhalgh; Zack Fields; Wendy Lindskoog; Archie Giddings; Tracy Lohman; Kari Gardey; Lois Epstein; Mary Lu Harle; Andrew Richie; Vivian Underwood; Teresa Brewer; Joni Wilm; Aaron Jongenelen; James Starzec; Brian Lindamood, P.E.; Hannah Gustafson; Hal Hart; Bart Rudolph; Jacques Annandale  <b>Cc:</b> Kari Gardey; Mary Lu Harle  <b>Subject:</b> Transforming Anchorage/Matsu Transportation</p> <p>Dear committee members,</p>

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>In case you have not already heard, Alaska Common Ground is sponsoring a series of events titled <u>Transforming Anchorage/Matsu Transportation</u>. Please see flyer attached. The next event is this Wednesday April 5, 7 pm: Mayor Paul Soglin from Madison Wisconsin is the speaker.</p> <p>I am sorry I did not send this flyer in time for the March 22 event. I was in Seattle cramming for an exam. ( Both LaMarr and I do the commuter rail work as volunteers, so sometimes money earning has to take priority). The April 11 event on transportation planning is very relevant to our efforts. LaMarr and I will be on the panel at the April 25 event. May 9 with the policymakers will be extremely important: more on that later.</p> <p>We will be having another committee meeting soon. However, right now participating in Alaska Common Ground's transportation events is the most important thing you can do.</p> <p>Thanks.</p>
1 Apr 2017	Lizzie Newell	General Comment	<p><b>From:</b> lizzie-n  <b>Sent:</b> Saturday, April 01, 2017 9:18 AM  <b>To:</b> Cynthia Wentworth; Jan Bronson; Allen Kemplen; LaMarr Anderson; Lizzie Newell; Travis Montgomery; farnsworth Paul; kubitx James; Riki Lebman; John Roderick; Jessica Smith; Brad Sworts; Schawna Thoma; Susanne Fleek-Green; Bill Sheffield; Chris Rose; Ryan Schryver; David Greenhalgh; Zack Fields; Wendy Lindskoog; Archie Giddings; Tracy Lohman; Kari Gardey; Lois Epstein; Mary Lu Harle; Andrew Richie; Vivian Underwood; Teresa Brewer; Joni Wilm; Aaron Jongenelen; James Starzec; Brian Lindamood, P.E.; Hannah Gustafson; Hal Hart; Bart Rudolph; Jacques Annandale  <b>Cc:</b> Kari Gardey; Mary Lu Harle</p> <p><b>Subject:</b> RE: Transforming Anchorage/Matsu Transportation</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>I was at the March 22 event. It was interesting. I learned out urban planning, housing, and tax revenue works with public transit. The basic idea is that the areas around transit stops should be zoned for high density mixed use. The increase in property value=&gt;tax revenue pays for the transit infrastructure. This increases affordable housing at the same time.</p> <p>Other take aways:</p> <p>Get rid of one way streets downtown. This will help downtown restaurants and businesses because it's easier to read restaurant signs at 20 mph. I would love for this change to occur. I don't go downtown as often as I might because I find the one way streets confusing.</p> <p>--Payment cards for bus usage. You load up the card with money and swipe it to pay. The cost of the trip can very depending on the distance and time of day. Yes! Please. I want these. I might ride the bus if I didn't have to scrounge for quarters.</p> <p>--HOV lane on the Seward highway.</p> <p>Sent from <a href="#">Mail</a> for Windows 10</p>
4 Apr 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	<p>Could use explanation that MAP-21 "FAST" Act, SAFETEA-LU are all federal transportation programs that AMATS is required to comply with, in order to receive federal funding.</p>

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
4 Apr 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Missing from the “Guiding Principals” on page 6 is any mention that the planning needs to have consistent underlying socio-economic data between regions and agencies. The April 8, 2011 <i>Transportation Planning Certification Review</i> from FHWA to AMATS included many “corrective actions” related to the lack of consistent underlying assumptions between regional areas, and differing agencies. This is particularly important related to roads and highways connecting Anchorage to the rest of the state. A typical comment on page 29 of that Certification Review was: “While the financial plans used in metropolitan transportation planning and statewide transportation planning are different from those developed for major highway and transit projects, their underlying assumptions (e.g. local economic conditions; future inflation rates; revenue sources, growth rates, and yields based upon population and employment projections) should be consistent.” The “corrective actions” included the need for consistency between AMATS and the MSB, better regional coordination, better coordination and communication between DOT and AMATS, all of which will affect both the validity of the 2040 MTP Update process and certification that the 2040 MTP Update will be fiscally constrained.
4 Apr 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Page 6, Transparency should be a guiding principal. Citizens should not have to file a FOIA request to get basic planning information like estimated daily trips, socio-economic forecasts, Traffic Analysis Zone data, etc.
4 Apr 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Page 6, under “integrate land use planning”: The MOA Land Use Plan is currently under development. Is the LUP going to be influencing the MTP, or vice versa? I have not seen anything where the two planning entities even get a chance to meet, much less trying to be consistent with the 2020 Comprehensive Plan, or Title 21.
4 Apr 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Page 7, Item 3, Study Area: Needs to acknowledge that the MOA is connected to the MSB & KPB, and the need to get consistent data, and describe how to get it.
4 Apr 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Public Meetings: Probably a better way to describe public meetings than being “mean”. It is tough enough to get the public to be involved!
4 Apr 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Pages 10 & 11, under Roles & Responsibilities of the TAC, Air Quality Advisory Committee, and P&Z, I would expect that their R&R’s also include providing comments, but that is not listed.
4 Apr 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Page 11, under Stakeholders: AMATS is significantly affected by MSB traffic decisions. Should be noted and incorporated as to how these regional issues will be handled. Yes, MSB is listed on pg 12, but deserves special mention.
4 Apr 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Page 11, under Roles & Responsibilities: Doesn’t the FHWA/FTA also approve the fiscal constraint determination?
4 Apr 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	As Jon Spring stated, the CAC (and TAC, B&PAC, FAC, AQAC) should provide formal comments from the entire CAC. It may be more of an internal issue for how the CAC’s role and protocols are still developing, but I think that the PIP (and PPP) should also describe how comments from individual members are handled/incorporated, or offered as “dissenting opinions”.
4 Apr 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Table 1 of Potential Stakeholders, should probably have a disclaimer of “but not limited to”.
4 Apr 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Page 16, The CAC should at least have an “Inform” and or “Consult” role in Phase 2.
4 Apr 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Pages 17, 19, & 21, for Phases 3, 4, & 5, I feel that the CAC should have a “Consult” role.

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
4 Apr 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	The "Inform", "Consult", roles on pages 15 to 24 don't seem to match the "Inform, Review, Recommend" roles on pages 24 to 27. For example for Phases 3, 4, & 5, the CAC is shown as having a "involve" role i.e. "to ensure that public issues and concerns are consistently understood and considered" versus having a "review" role, i.e. "to review the draft documents and provide written comments" for many of the Deliverables.
4 Apr 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	The "Review" and "Recommend" roles on page 24 seem overlapping. What is the difference between "provide written comments", and "provide guidance on action"?
4 Apr 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Page 28, Evaluation: Seems like there could be a "Lessons learned" review attached to each Deliverables phase, rather than an arbitrary every 6 months review.
4 Apr 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Pg 28, Advertising & Media Plan: Should also involve postings on "Nextdoor" or perhaps "Nixle".
5 Apr 2017	Adison Smith	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	In general, there needs to be engagement/discussion that recognizes the large population of residents (Alaska Natives) who visit Anchorage from rural Alaska on a daily/monthly/yearly basis for doctors' appointments, shopping, conferences and trainings. These folks visiting Anchorage utilize our transportation system and should be consulted with during this planning process. Tribal health organizations such as Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium (ANTHC) and the South Central Foundation (SFC) have their own transportation systems/needs, and could benefit from working with AMATS during the planning and project development phases for projects in Anchorage. This engagement would be valuable for Anchorage and the entire State of Alaska. Other entities such as the Alaska Federation of Natives and the Bureau of Indian Affairs hold two of the largest conferences in our state here in Anchorage. I recommend engaging those organizations as well.
5 Apr 2017	Adison Smith	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Cover page. AMATS- spell out- the general public does not know what AMATS is.
5 Apr 2017	Adison Smith	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	5.3 Stakeholders. Add visits to sentence #2.
5 Apr 2017	Adison Smith	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	5.3 Stakeholders. Add Tribal Health Organizations to sentence #4.
5 Apr 2017	Adison Smith	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Table 1: Potential Stakeholders. Add Community Councils? Sand Lake CC needs to be engaged.
5 Apr 2017	Adison Smith	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Table 1: Potential Stakeholders. Edit add, State of Alaska, Department of Health and Human Services.
5 Apr 2017	Adison Smith	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Table 1: Potential Stakeholders. Edit typo, Alaska Dept. of Transportation and Public Facilities.
5 Apr 2017	Adison Smith	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Table 1: Potential Stakeholders. Add Alaska Federation of Natives
5 Apr 2017	Adison Smith	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Table 1: Potential Stakeholders. Add Alaska Department of Education

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
5 Apr 2017	Adison Smith	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Table 1: Potential Stakeholders. Edit typo, Americans with Disabilities Act Advisory Commission
5 Apr 2017	Adison Smith	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Table 1: Potential Stakeholders. Add Alaska Native Tribal Health Organization
5 Apr 2017	Adison Smith	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Table 1: Potential Stakeholders. Add South Central Foundation
5 Apr 2017	Adison Smith	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	5.4 Title VI/LEP Plan to Reach Minority, Low-income, and Limited English Populations. What about the low income residents that travel to Anchorage from rural Alaska for Doctors appointments, basketball tourneys etc? They utilize our trans system and should be given the opp to provide input on the MTP.
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	1 MTP Overview and Context. What influence does the economy have on our transportation needs? As stated, this draws a link between the need for transportation improvements and the local economy (i.e. we only need transportation improvements if the economy is growing). If this link is unintended, suggest revising.
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	1 MTP Overview and Context. Edit. MPO is previously defined/used.
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	1 MTP Overview and Context. We who? Please define or change use of first person narrative.
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	1 MTP Overview and Context. The following list reads like action items rather than principles that will guide the attainment of a goal (e.g. completed MTP). Consider revising either the list or naming of the list as principles.
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	1 MTP Overview and Context. What is meaningful public involvement? Please define.
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	1 MTP Overview and Context. What is the temporal scale of the PIP? As stated, it could be inferred that the PIP covers the entire life of the MTP and not just its development.
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	1 MTP Overview and Context. Edit, strike text. Pushing stakeholders into a schedule-driven position will negatively influence the quality and quantity of public stakeholder engagement. It is not the fault of the community that the MTP is on a tight schedule. Suggest re-approaching the goal of timely completion of the MTP through prompt public participation through a collaborative argument that acknowledges the important work ahead without preemptively curtailing participation.
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	2 Requirements for Public Involvement. Jumping directly into a section on requirements leaves the impression that Public Involvement (and this plan) only exists because it is required. Suggest feathering this into the previous section and expanding the intro section to cover MTP and PIP Overview/Context.
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	3 Study Area. Please describe why the reader should refer to Appendix B (i.e. for maps of the study area).
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	4 Strategy. What is effective community engagement? Please define.
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	4 Strategy. What is the program intending to encompass? All stakeholders in the study area? Is this an achievable strategy?

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	4 Strategy. How will working drafts be shared?
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	4 Strategy. What is meant by Preferred Alternative (e.g. development, selection, evaluation)?
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	4 Strategy. Suggest not describing public meetings as "mean." Also, consider revising the depiction as lean given the previous description as "large public meetings."
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	4 Strategy. Is this one of the guiding principles previously listed? If not, should it be added?
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	5.3 Stakeholders. The framing of Chapter 5 infers that committees previously discussed are not stakeholders. Suggest reviewing this approach to evaluate if it is intended/appropriate or if an approach through internal and external stakeholders should be made.
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	5.3 Stakeholders. Phase 1 has not yet been defined. Suggest defining Phase 1 or revising accordingly so that the reader is not first introduced to Phase 2.
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	5.3 Stakeholders. What list? Please clarify.
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	5.3 Stakeholders. Please clarify this statement. Is the PI team intending to "offer to make presentations" to all stakeholder groups?
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Table 1 Potential Stakeholders. Suggest incorporating a process to update this list of potential stakeholders as the project moves forward.
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	8 Evaluation. Edit, strike text. Duplicate word.
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	8 Evaluation. Please define the "different tools and timing." For example, will committees receive updates from PM Meetings where changes in PIP tactics are decided?
5 Apr 2017	Jeff Raun	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	9 Advertising and Media Plan. 1. How will advertising effectiveness measurement occur? 2. Why not advertise through direct email to Municipal employees? 3. How will local youth be targeted for engagement (e.g. Anchorage School District advertising/partnership campaign)?
5 Apr 2017	AMATS Staff	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Remove all references to activity and meeting locations.
5 Apr 2017	AMATS Staff	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Update track changes throughout document.
5 Apr 2017	AMATS Staff	<a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a>	Include how to comment icon from adopted Public Participation Plan.

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
18 Apr 2017	Zack Fields	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1A</a>	<p>The 2040 draft is certainly an improvement over the status quo. However, I wonder if there is a way to address the conflict between reduced travel time for peak hour trips (implication: for automobiles) and safety.</p> <p>If an engineer is designing facilities to reduce peak hour travel time, that translates into lane widths and configurations, turning geometries, etc, designed for higher speed automobile travel. Those sorts of designs are more likely to result in pedestrian and bicyclist deaths, particularly in a place like Anchorage that has massively excessive automobile capacity on almost all roads at almost all times of day and night. Most designs that add or widen lanes to reduce automobile peak travel time are likely to result in higher vehicular speeds for the 23.9 hours of the day during which there is zero congestion on Anchorage roadways.</p> <p>In a city with crowded roads, this would be less of an issue because congestion would limit actual travel speeds more than road design. But in Anchorage, which has essentially zero congestion (except the Glenn Highway during a very brief rush hour), vehicle speeds are limited almost exclusively by things like lane width, turning radii, etc.</p> <p>A rational plan would place a higher priority on either safety or vehicular speed (depending on public policy priorities), or at least address and mitigate the conflict between them. Vision Zero indicates that the city and many partner non-profits prioritize safety. Maybe this 2040 document should reflect that. I certainly think preventing deaths and serious injuries (which are happening as a result of dangerous road designs) is more important than addressing non-existent congestion.</p>
1 May 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1A</a>	<p>“6E. Reduce unnecessary project delivery delays (which add to project costs) through efficient coordination” For projects that go through a NEPA process, taking short-cuts, and dropping key steps will open up projects to legal challenges. Project Fast-Tracking can have significant impacts on an inclusive public process, and in the past has been exacerbated by poor agency communications, un-realistic socio-economic forecasts, misrepresentation of facts, projects that don’t follow other planning documents, all of which contribute to poor decision making about projects and wasted time and money. My point is, do it right, have realistic data, and don’t short-cut the public process.</p>
1 May 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1A</a>	<p>System Reliability, also Goal 2B: I think if you asked commuters what "system reliability" means, they would say something like “available and not stuck in traffic”. Using alternate means of clearing crashes, having special “pull-outs” for minor fender-benders, for drivers to exchange insurance information, etc. such as is done in Illinois, along with better staging of tow-trucks, and streamlined police investigations could all help alleviate congestion, and improve system reliability, without adding additional lane miles.</p>
1 May 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1A</a>	<p>Environmental Sustainability: Objective “7A. Promote the development of a safe network of trails and sidewalks that provide reasonable access to work, schools, parks, services, shopping, and the natural environment, with priority given to trail and sidewalk projects expected to have the highest use.” This last portion feels like an excuse to limit trail &amp; sidewalk projects. A major problem with existing trails is the lack of connectivity between segments, and through-routes. Objective 5D is crucial. “5D. Enhance the physical connectivity between neighborhoods by increasing the number of roadway, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit connections.”</p>
1 May 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1A</a>	<p>Environmental Sustainability: Objective “7B. Optimize the year-round accessibility and convenience of travel choices and, in particular, improve the year-round reliability and travel time of transit through the implementation of programs such as transit signal priority.” The main problems with transit is 1: Lack</p>

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			of good, efficient connections, having to wait long periods at transfer sites. 2: Poor snow removal from sidewalks, and lack of cooperation between street and sidewalk clearing (having the street plows pile snow on recently cleared sidewalks) means that people can't use sidewalks, and can't get to the bus stops, and have to climb over the berm if you do make it to the sidewalk. 3: Public perception: People don't want to ride the "Loser Cruizer".
1 May 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1A</a>	Environmental Sustainability, and also Goal 5F: Objective "8A. Minimize adverse impacts on the community, such as neighborhood through-traffic movements. "The impacts of bisecting a neighborhood, such as what happened to Fairview by the expansion of the Gambell/Ingra couplet cannot be overstated. Nationwide, there are unfortunately too many examples of a formerly thriving neighborhood that withers when bisected by a new highway or arterial. Splitting up of a neighborhood should be strongly discouraged.
1 May 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1A</a>	Environmental Sustainability: Objective "8F. Reinforce the link between transit and land use by establishing as a priority the building of transit-friendly residential and commercial development in Downtown Anchorage and Downtown Eagle River." Suggest that transit-friendly development needs to occur between not just the two Downtowns listed, but also between the U/Med, Dimond Retail, Old Seward Retail south of Dimond, Muldoon, and Airport. Suggest re-writing to include more common destinations.
1 May 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1A</a>	Built Northern Environment: Northern City design standards can be improved. The city of Houghton/Hancock in the Upper Peninsula in Michigan, has implemented standards so that their sidewalks can be cleared of snow by wing plows, being cleared at the same time as the streets. They do that by moving signs, parking meters, and other items away from the road edge. See the pictures below, unfortunately low quality due to the originals from GoogleEarth Streetview.
1 May 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1A</a>	"Reduce Overlap" is used in many places in this table without being defined. It appears to be a shorthand used by HDR, and needs to be explained.
1 May 2017	AMATS Staff	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1A</a>	Correct the "Error! Reference source not found" under 4.3.
1 May 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1A</a>	Objective "3D. Improve the existing transportation system efficiency through the implementation of effective and innovative transportation system management (TSM), transportation demand management (TDM), and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) strategies." This jargon needs to be explained somewhere.
1 May 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1A</a>	Objective "6A. Prioritize the projects within the MTP to optimize the benefit-cost ratio". Transit is unfortunately not a luxury, but a necessity for many people without personal vehicles, and the alternative of Taxi Cabs, is unfortunately, very expensive. Perhaps Uber or Lyft will reduce those costs somewhat, but dropping routes because of a "benefit-cost ratio" means that some people will lose their only real option to get to jobs or shopping. See also discussion of how benefits are calculated. Need to figure out a better criteria than "benefit-cost" for Transit.
1 May 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1A</a>	Objective "3J. Increase competitiveness of transit". I can understand wanting to increase the "efficiency" or "ridership" of transit, but competitiveness is much less definable or measurable. Suggest Rewrite.
1 May 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1A</a>	"GOAL 6 Quality Decision-Making: Make sound public investment." Need to figure out how to reduce the political and institutional "thumb on the scales" that pushes un-wanted, and un-needed projects. Probably better screening criteria, more honest evaluations, and more attention paid to public comments, independent review as a reality check would help improve things.

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
1 May 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1A</a>	Performance Measures, Infrastructure Condition, Pg 44, Table 5-3 & Table 5-4: There are very few NHS and Interstate System roads in the MTP boundary. Yes, these are required by Federal rules, but there should be similar performance measures for local roads to evaluate their condition. This will facilitate reality based ranking, allow for better screening of projects. Ditto on Pg 41 & 42 under Congestion Reduction and Tables 5-4 & 5-4.
1 May 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1A</a>	Performance Measures, Infrastructure Condition: "Percentage of vehicles that have met or exceeded their Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)." It is not clear if this referring to vehicles of the general public, or to Muni or State vehicles. If this is public vehicles, how is this data obtained?
1 May 2017	AMATS Staff	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1A</a>	Staff has asked the contractor to consider various tools for estimating the benefit/cost ratio and to make a recommendation to AMATS.
1 May 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1A</a>	It would be good for AMATS to follow protocols that major industries and the Alaska Liquefied Natural Gas export pipeline project use; a phased approach, evaluating each phase prior to proceeding with additional project investment, including addressing uncertainties early in the project development process. This is especially important related to megaproject development, with multiple funding gates and increasingly reduced uncertainty in cost and schedule as time goes on. The critical questions that should be asked at the completion of each phase are: 1. Have any of the fundamental assumptions regarding the project changed including the scope of work, capital and operating cost estimates, revenue projections, project schedule, regulatory environment, technical feasibility, and stakeholder support? 2. Are there external factors that could change the rationale for the project such as technologies reducing the need for vehicles, changes to the population growth, etc. 3. Is this the best use of state/federal money at this point in time? 4. Is there a viable business case or a clear path forward to obtain one? 5. Have project risks been identified and mitigation plans put in place? 6. Is there a solid basis for the project's capital costs and have they been benchmarked with other similar projects? 7. Has there been an independent capital cost estimate? 8. Has the work done in the previous stage been fully documented and been peer reviewed? 9. Does the project team have a robust plan of work with clearly specified deliverables and a budget in place for the next stage of work? 10. Is the project still consistent with the long range plans of the State of Alaska?
1 May 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1A</a>	Many pages: How is the Benefit/Cost ratio calculated? This can be an area that is manipulated to make one project appear "better" than another. Need to have reality-based calculations and evaluations.
1 May 2017	AMATS Staff	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1B</a>	Remove fatal flaw screening image from figure 2-1
1 May 2017	AMATS Staff	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1B</a>	Remove the fatal flaw screening.
1 May 2017	AMATS Staff	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1B</a>	Add footnotes for the following criteria: Level of Community Impacts, Improve the existing transportation system efficiency through the implementation of the effective and innovative transportation system management (TSM), transportation demand management (TDM), and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) strategies, and Economic Benefits.
1 May 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1B</a>	Refined Screening: "In some cases, projects may be included in the MTP based on information not easily evaluated by these criteria." Similar to above; need to figure out how to reduce the political and institutional "thumb on the scales" that pushes un-wanted and un-needed projects.
1 May 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1B</a>	Regional Connections: Need to be aware of the 600 Lb Gorilla, the APE, or Area of Potential Effects. It doesn't serve the screening process when the traffic impacts analyzed by the APE stops on a little used section of road, but causes big congestion impacts on more heavily traveled roads just blocks outside of the APE.

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
1 May 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1B</a>	Level of Environmental Impacts & Level of Community Impacts: In “fair” column, it is important not only that “impacts can be mitigated”, but that the proposed mitigation is actually acceptable to the community.
1 May 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1B</a>	Economic Benefits: As above, Evaluation of Economic Benefits needs to be carefully constructed. Should have more backup than what is shown here.
1 May 2017	AMATS Staff	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1B</a>	The AMATS project team does not prioritize transit projects for the MTP.
1 May 2017	Bob French	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1B</a>	Basic questions: Who does the screening evaluation? Is there public involvement? How does the public get to review the rating/evaluations before they are “finalized”? What kind of background data is released to the public regarding foundational data like Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) numbers, Socio-economic assumptions, population estimates, etc.? Is there an independent QC check on if that foundational data makes sense? All of that information affects things like “cost-benefit ratios”, ridership, congestion estimates, etc.
1 May 2017	AMATS Staff	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Add Definitions: Regional Connections, Level of Community Impacts, Environmental Justice, ADA, and TSM, TDM and ITS, and Economic Benefits.
1 May 2017	AMATS Staff	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Deliverability. Add the word “/or” after the word “and” in each score level.
8 May 2017	Abul Hassan	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1B</a>	<p><b>From:</b> Hassan, Abul  <b>Sent:</b> Monday, May 08, 2017 9:15 AM  <b>To:</b> Underwood, Vivian R.  <b>Cc:</b> Rudolph, Bart H; Lyon, Craig H.  <b>Subject:</b> Attachment 1B Comments</p> <p>Hi Vivian,</p> <p>I am hoping to send you comments to 1A by the end of the day and below are my comments, thoughts, and questions regarding 1B. The format is broken out by page#.</p> <p>General: Please define “transit.” To me it is not obvious what the word transit refers to throughout the document and so becomes cumbersome and confusing as to whether I am commenting on public transportation or some other mode.</p> <p>Page 5: Table 2-1; How exactly did we come up with these categories? I skimmed through some parts, but, maybe adding on this page the actual methodology. For example, if you have 50 project submissions are you ranking each one based on each category and so the final score under each element makes it a top 5 candidate or a bottom 5 and therefore not considered?</p>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>Page 6: Level of Environmental Impact &amp; Level of Community Impact: Consider whether you are implying that the impact is positive or negative -- that might make or break the rating criteria and is not obvious when reading the document.</p> <p>Page 7: Seems to me we are missing a few categories in table 2-1 (project scoring criteria): 1) Urban Densification (in-fill) 2) Multi-jurisdictional coordination 3) Innovation 4) Wild Life (Meaning does the project better the navigation of wild life through design features or at least reduces road kill) 5) Carbon Footprint Offset.</p> <p>I had a question mark regarding "Preservation of Existing Facility," not sure what the relevance of this category is.</p> <p>I would most certainly keep in the notion TSM, TDM, and ITS in relation to the two.</p> <p>Page 9: In Table 2-3 under Timing of Need where it states that criterion 5 is "Addresses major safety/capacity needs." This seems to me to be arbitrary; for example, how are you compensating for densification? A road project could come along promising to build a wall in the middle of tudor while expanding it to three lanes each way and might be rated 5 but does not consider that the road needs to be built in the context of the density around it.</p> <p>Functional Classification: Do SDOT and MOA agree on the terms "collector, arterial/expressway, and highway."</p> <p>Obstacles to Construction: Under criterion 1 was the notion of significant effort to resolve political or logistical?</p> <p>Table 2-4 Where it states "additional transit service," when I read criterion -2 it occurs to me that if we took the visioning project and ranked it in this category we would qualify as the worse project under that table because what we did was reduce service coverage and remove transit amenities." I have to imagine that that was not the intent of this table -- it needs to be fixed.</p> <p>I would include a category here that states, "Increase private buy-in."</p> <p>Generally speaking I found the categories and ranking superficial insomuch as that the core issues we are struggling with in Anchorage do not seem to be addressed. Its reads a lot like, "business as usual," where different players operate in their individual paradigm(s) without consideration of how their other partners are affected by the projects that the entire committee gets to advocate for and good money is allocated for.</p> <p>Thanks, Abul</p>
9 May 2017	Abul Hassan	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1A</a>	<p><b>From:</b> Hassan, Abul  <b>Sent:</b> Tuesday, May 09, 2017 8:34 AM</p>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p><b>To:</b> Underwood, Vivian R.  <b>Cc:</b> Rudolph, Bart H; Lyon, Craig H.  <b>Subject:</b> Attachment 1A Comments</p> <p>Hi Vivian,</p> <p>I took some time to review this on my flight down. Here are a mix of my comments, thoughts, and possibly some question(s); by page.</p> <p>Page 2: Congestion Reduction -- I get that this information is out of Map 21 and the Fast Act; however, I worry that people have different interpretation(s) to what congestion reduction looks like. Its the difference between a build more and over engineer everything philosophy vs., what Europe is doing in terms of realizing that there is no ultimate (road build) engineering solutions to congestion caused by density so they offset the congestion by investing in other modes.</p> <p>Page 4: Safety: In 1D the notion of "improving," something in Anchorage is in my personal opinion generally counter intuitive to what we seek in relation to Public Transportation and also what we seek in terms of densification. I would either define the word improve or add that there are more ways to improve something than aquire more ROW and build more lanes.  In 2C I would replace the word community with City  In 5E: I would seek to define the word transit and separate public transportation from other modes of transportation -- as a general note, in this entire document, I have trouble figuring out what is being referred to when the word 'transit,' is used.</p> <p>Infrastructure Condition: In 3F I would change to read: "Maintain, <b>change classification, downgrade</b>, or rehabilitate that existing transportation system to minimize deterioration and the need for major construction projects."</p> <p>Page 11: I had a conversation with some community council representatives out in Eagle River a while back. How does this plan reconcile the way their neighborhood plans are in stark contrast to the recommendation(s) in the LUP. This is to say, what will the MTP include if there is that difference?  Page 13: Under transportation I would endeavor to incorporate the concept of a transportation ecosystem in relation to seamless mobility. One good benefit of connecting with my peers here at APTA is a confirmation that they are alarmed by uber/lyft and what micro-transit through shared mobility can do as a disruptor to mass transportation. The highlight is, instead of fighting the disruption they have chosen to engage with micro-transit providers and take the lead in immersing mass transportation as the guiding force behind shared mobility across all modes. To not mention this in the MTP would be short-sighted of us.</p> <p>General Observation: I keep noting a reference to transportation, let's take page 20 Goal 4. It outlines the notion of a transportation system that supports the needs of say the airport. Now, I know I am in conversations with John Parrott about this and as a result of those conversations spenard has 15 minute headways yet I read the goal as being focused on ARRC. So is the expectation here that light rail will be built? Or, that ARRC will begin utilizing their property</p>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>there, or, is it that our 15 minute headways by 2025 and into 2030 will become a BRT corridor? These specifics are very important when analyzing future projects.</p> <p>TAM: All transit agencies were required to forward a recommendation for TAM to their council of governments and/or AMATS and/or associated counterparts by January with said entities to incorporate those measure(s) by sometime in July or August and for FTA to see that by the end of the year. I had requested a work session to Craig to discuss this in depth so SDOT, PTD, and ARRC were using like-measures but my e-mail might have been overlooked while Craig was on vacation. I still feel the need to have such a work session so TAM priorities at least have some common parameters. More importantly, PTD is working with Ned at the FTA and I am coordinating with APTA's legislative lobbying section to request through APTA that TAM's deadlines be extended.</p> <p>Table 5-3: I would stress the need to look at this through a multi-modal lense. All solutions to congestion cannot be road based through engineering design. I certainly would hope the MTP reflects a balance here where offset to congestion takes into account funding transfers to enable public transportation to offset the congestion issue.</p> <p>Sorry my comments are a bit rushed.</p> <p>Thanks, Abul</p>
9 May 2017	Connor Scher	General Comment	<p><b>From:</b> Connor Scher  <b>Sent:</b> Tuesday, May 09, 2017 7:50 AM  <b>To:</b> AMATS Info  <b>Subject:</b> Public Comment Statement</p> <p>To whoever it may concern:  Please find attached a statement for the Anchorage Metropolitan Area Transportation Solutions public comments. I am a resident of Anchorage studying in Portland, but I intend to live full-time in Anchorage after I graduate.</p> <p>Thank you, and respectfully yours,  Connor Scher</p> <p>ædifex  Masters of Architecture Candidate, 2018  Portland State University  <a href="http://www.claro-scuro.com">www.claro-scuro.com</a></p>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>Notes from Portland: Beware the Myth</p> <p>I have spent some time now in the City of Roses, but lived most of my life in the shadow of the Chugach in Anchorage. During my time there, I held the belief that Portland was the paragon of urban planning, and that no other American city rivalled their transportation system. Tobe sure, Portland did make very successful moves in its development, and I think Anchorage can learn a lesson or two.</p> <p>During the late 1970s, the City of Portland enacted the Urban Growth Boundary, expressly stating that density and growth would not sprawl along the river valleys, as in L.A., Detroit, and Chicago. This was successful in that it limited outward growth, but its citizens still wanted the feel of suburban neighborhoods and small civic centers. Downtown had towers and density, but the rest of the city grew horizontally. With increased growth in the suburbs, the City expanded its boundary, shortsightedly. Now, with a population growing exponentially, and the single-family neighborhoods rejecting density, Portland faces a housing crisis. The City’s solution is to deploy hundreds of tiny-houses and Accessory Dwelling Units to densify neighborhoods, but these solutions will be inadequate. Small-scale development, although more attractive and palatable than high-rises, is inefficient and does not solve social problems like gentrification and lack of affordable housing.</p> <p>How does Anchorage relate? Around 1980 Portland had the same population as Anchorage has today. If we choose to implement some of Portland’s policies, Anchorage could be on track to contemporary Portland—expensive, dirty, poorly maintained, gentrifying, and unsustainably growing. Anchorage seems to have exhausted its developable land, and must choose density. Striking a balance between maintaining single-family neighborhoods and small civic centers relying on a strong Downtown core is difficult. The neighborhood model of Portland is successful: most homeowners can walk to a grocery, restaurant, coffee shop, cinema or library, schools, and parks.</p> <p>Anchorage’s built infrastructure lends itself to low-impact redevelopment to enhance its neighborhoods. These might be revitalizing the commercial zones at major intersections, and improving pedestrian access to those zones. Coupled with diverse housing stock, these centers can provide basic needs of food, community, and work for the neighborhoods. Anchorage should not rely on only dense, expensive housing Downtown, nor tiny houses to solve its growth needs.</p> <p>In the early 1980s, Portland built the first light-rail commuter train in the U.S. in sixty years. The MAX lines now snake from the edges of town and thread through Downtown. These light-rail and the trolley lines give commuters alternatives to cars to get to work and the city. I have heard suggestions of light-rail in Anchorage before, but critics claim the ridership does not exist. Portland invented its ridership within the same population as Anchorage today. I believe that light-rail could improve transportation. I imagine a line running on the A.R.R easement (or using the existing tracks) from Wasilla to Downtown and thence to the airport and Girdwood. An expanded system would include a line running from Downtown to Midtown on the A and CSt corridors, and one running from the A.N.M.C. Campus to the airport along Tudor Rd. The dangers of light-rail, as seen in Portland are several. The lines displace population and encourage sub-urban sprawl.</p> <p>The increased land value along the lines evicts lower-income residents. The stigma of relying on public transit still exists. Additionally, Portland’s system is now inefficient and the population out-grew the lines. For successful tramlines, look to Europe, especially Basel, Switzerland.</p>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>Portland did not expand its road system but in many places reduced the efficiency. As a result, traffic in the city slogs through the dense core and the cars crawl along the freeways. Portland streets are narrow, and the small blocks mean many intersections. Anchorage has many wide and fast roads because we had the space. Now that we have occupied the land, we should think about alternative uses of the existing infrastructure. The answer should not be more roads or more lanes, but different patterns and alignments within the existing system. Tudor Rd needs its five lanes only a few hours each day.</p> <p>Additionally, one lane can have multiple uses. Portland has shared bike and bus lanes, driving lanes that become parking lanes on weekends, and bike-only intersections. In the 1960s, freeways sliced through Portland neighborhoods, displacing and isolating communities. In relation to the infamous Highway-to-Highway Project, and other highway development in the Municipality, please consider that wide roads divide the city and form barriers to people, and animals.</p> <p>Portland, long touted as a bike-friendly city, has its shortcomings for bikers. The bike routes provide great access from Downtown to the East, but there are few North-South routes, and those are convoluted and inconvenient. In some respects, Anchorage outdoes Portland because of its miles of multi-use and paved paths, throughout the city.</p> <p>Portland does not have many of these, and they are not convenient for commuters, unlike the Chester and Campbell Creek Trails. The three creek trails in Anchorage and the Coastal Trail are invaluable resources and should receive enhancement into the future. The North-South C St corridor trail is inadequate, however, and I suggest a multi-use path that parallels the railroad through Midtown and South Anchorage would be much more attractive, and receive higher levels of ridership. Portland has a multi-use path that does just this, following a rail line South from Downtown. A fence separates the tracks from the trail. Extending a multi-use system along the utility corridor East of Muldoon would service the Northeast of town. More multi-use paths South of Dimond would be a welcome addition. Portland has many shared roadways, which is nice in residential neighborhoods but frustrating in the urban areas. Creatively, a parking lane often separates bike and traffic lanes. Additionally, many major streets have special bike turn-lanes or waiting boxes. I think the strongest aspects of the Portland system are the signposts for bikers giving directions and times to destinations along each major route. I believe that bike infrastructure enhances the cityscape and should augment—or at least parallel—development with that for automobiles.</p> <p>Anchorage is a wonderful, beautiful, and healthy city. In planning its future, it may seem easy to copy the techniques of Outside cities, as it did its architecture, food, and commerce. However, the path forward should not borrow, but improve upon the lessons from other cities, especially Portland. More and more—however unhappily—I hear how Anchorage is becoming like Portland. The image of Portland, from visitor’s perspective (one critic called it “through rose-colored classes”), is much different from the reality. At once, a tourist or local can take the MAX line from the Airport to Downtown, but the trip takes twice as long as the same does by car. A commuter can bike anywhere in the city, but because of designated bike routes cannot easily reach his or her destination. The freeways do not alleviate local traffic congestion and slice the city into disparate parts.</p> <p>We should not need more highways between the Valley and Town, but alternative transportation options. Highways are expensive to build, maintain, and accidents are frequent. The cost to animals and the ecosystem is too great. A connector from the Seward to the Glenn Highways would do nothing to alleviate traffic (little traffic is moving between the Peninsula and the Valley) and would further divide East and West Anchorage, isolating already under-served neighborhoods.</p>

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>We do not need any more roads, either—especially the Elmore extension through APU—but ones that are more efficient. Bike lanes and paths enhance the city and should be a part of any growth plan. Anchorage can learn much from Portland, but I urge the Planners not to succumb to the myth of the City of Roses. I want to see Anchorage develop to a healthier, less automobile-centric city, but I especially do not want it to become Portland.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read my comments. I look forward to living in a well-planned Anchorage as a working professional.</p>
11 May 2017	Cynthia Wentworth	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Regional Connections. Per the TAC meeting minutes, from May 11, 2017: Regional Connections, which scores proposed projects based on their impact on roads. She remarked that there is no way for the Alaska Railroad to compete for MTP projects if this criteria remains as is and it should be modified to at least include the word “multi-modal”.
12 May 2017	Sylvia Panzarella	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Operational Improvements. A large problem with the Seward Hwy safety aspect has to do with speeding. The current speed limits are much too fast and could be drastically reduced. This would save a lot of money as well as saving the beauty of the road. With the money saved more troopers/police could be hired to give out large speeding tickets. JBER has no problems with speeders as they do not tolerate it.
12 May 2017	Sylvia Panzarella	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Regional Connections. Commuter rail would be FANTASTIC!
12 May 2017	Sylvia Panzarella	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Bicycle Route/Trail Use. We have a wonderful trail system which could be even more so with wider and more trails. There is a strong interest in commuting to work these days. Racing bikers need to remember that the trails are shared and slow down a bit. Community trail monitors could improve safety.
12 May 2017	Sylvia Panzarella	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Sidewalk Use. Signs to remind racer bicycles to slow down
12 May 2017	Sylvia Panzarella	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Deliverability. I am not certain that I understand your questions but I am very interested in the planning of this city
16 May 2017	Kristine Bunnell	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Environmental Justice and ADA. Should not be combined. Each needs to be judged separately.
16 May 2017	Carol Wong	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Comment form makes it difficult to make comments while also being able to look at the document.
16 May 2017	Aves Thompson	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Should there be a rating category for improving or degrading freight movements?
16 May 2017	Aves Thompson	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Or maybe decreasing or increasing the incidence of truck-auto, truck ped or truck bicycle conflicts?
17 May 2017	Cindee Karns	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Residents of Eagle River and Chugiak need public bus service. Twice a day, busses drive our neighborhoods. Why can't I use the school bus to get a ride into Eagle River? That would solve 3 problems. 1. They could bring folks into Eagle River in time to catch the bus into town for work. 2. Adults could ride busses and keep the children settled. (When was the last time YOU rode on a school bus?) 3. If there was another bus at the end of the day, students could stay after school for activities and then ride the evening bus home with their parents. Of course there would need to be incentives as well. Internet on the bus? Tax credits. Stud credits (you wouldn't have to pay for studs on your car). Donuts for families? I don't know.... The concerns have been that there could be child molesters getting on the bus with the kids. We could have segregated busses with the adults in the back. We could have adults ride for 1/2 price if they want

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>to be a bus monitor and get a background check. There are any number of things that we could do. Getting cars off the road each morning would help our roads---the ruts are CRAZY dangerous. They would allow more kids to do activities after school. They would create a calmer atmosphere on the busses. There are probably many other positives that will only come to light when we try it. NOTE: I didn't even mention a reduction in CO2 emissions.</p>
18 May 2017	Cheryl Richardson	General Comment	<p><b>From:</b> Cheryl Richardson  <b>Sent:</b> Thursday, May 18, 2017 9:24 AM  <b>To:</b> Underwood, Vivian R.  <b>Subject:</b> Good Morning Vivian,</p> <p>Can you tell me please if the MTP process has a public involvement process that's been released for public review?</p> <p>Thank you,  Cheryl</p>
18 May 2017	Cheryl Richardson	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	<p><b>From:</b> Cheryl Richardson  <b>Sent:</b> Thursday, May 18, 2017 9:51 PM  <b>To:</b> AMATS Info  <b>Cc:</b> Lyon, Craig H.; Hart, Hal H; john weddleton  <b>Subject:</b> Seeking one month extension to review AMATS screening criteria</p> <p>Anchorage Citizens Coalition asks for an additional month to respond to AMATS' recently released Metropolitan Transportation Plan screening criteria.</p> <p>AMATS' current deadline is May 26. We ask the deadline be moved to June 26, 2017</p> <p>The importance of MTP goals and objectives,  - the lack of advance notice that review of goals and objectives has been underway since February,  - the large volume of background paperwork released just last week and  - the fact that it is springtime in Alaska put the public at a great disadvantage.</p> <p>This work is too important to shortchange.</p> <p>We also ask AMATS to release its MTP public involvement process for public review and comment.</p> <p>Thank you,  Cheryl Richardson</p>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment																																																						
20 May 2017	Zack Fields	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Environmental Justice and ADA. Environmental justice and ADA should probably be separate screening criteria because for many projects they will not be the same. For example, a road widening could worsen localized PM concentrations but have sufficient sidewalks for ADA compliance. That project would be fine by an ADA metric but negative from the perspective of environmental justice.																																																						
22 May 2017	James Starzec	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	<p>My comment is that the criteria should be weighted to express the fact that some of these items are more important than others. For example, it doesn't make sense that having an ITS component scores the same as directly addressing a safety issue. Solving a safety issue should be a higher priority and given a greater consideration. Below is an example of how it could be done.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="701 493 2040 1227"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="701 493 1696 532">Criteria</th> <th data-bbox="1696 493 1911 532">Focus</th> <th data-bbox="1911 493 2040 532">Weight</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 532 1696 571">Addresses Safety Issue</td> <td data-bbox="1696 532 1911 571">System Upkeep</td> <td data-bbox="1911 532 2040 571">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 571 1696 610">Deliverability</td> <td data-bbox="1696 571 1911 610">System Upkeep</td> <td data-bbox="1911 571 2040 610">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 610 1696 649">Level of Consistency With Other Adopted Plans or Studies</td> <td data-bbox="1696 610 1911 649">System Upkeep</td> <td data-bbox="1911 610 2040 649">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 649 1696 688">Preservation of Existing Facility</td> <td data-bbox="1696 649 1911 688">System Upkeep</td> <td data-bbox="1911 649 2040 688">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 688 1696 727">Operational Improvements</td> <td data-bbox="1696 688 1911 727">System Upkeep</td> <td data-bbox="1911 688 2040 727">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 727 1696 766">Improve the Existing Transportation System Through TSM, TDM or ITS Strategies.</td> <td data-bbox="1696 727 1911 766">System Upkeep</td> <td data-bbox="1911 727 2040 766">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 766 1696 805"></td> <td data-bbox="1696 766 1911 805"></td> <td data-bbox="1911 766 2040 805"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 805 1696 844">Regional Connections</td> <td data-bbox="1696 805 1911 844">Connectivity</td> <td data-bbox="1911 805 2040 844">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 844 1696 883">System Connectivity (Motorized &amp; non-Motorized)</td> <td data-bbox="1696 844 1911 883">Connectivity</td> <td data-bbox="1911 844 2040 883">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 883 1696 922">Bicycle Route/Trail Use</td> <td data-bbox="1696 883 1911 922">Connectivity</td> <td data-bbox="1911 883 2040 922">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 922 1696 961">Transit Access</td> <td data-bbox="1696 922 1911 961">Connectivity</td> <td data-bbox="1911 922 2040 961">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 961 1696 1000">Sidewalk Use</td> <td data-bbox="1696 961 1911 1000">Connectivity</td> <td data-bbox="1911 961 2040 1000">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 1000 1696 1039"></td> <td data-bbox="1696 1000 1911 1039"></td> <td data-bbox="1911 1000 2040 1039"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 1039 1696 1078">Level of Community Impacts</td> <td data-bbox="1696 1039 1911 1078">Equity</td> <td data-bbox="1911 1039 2040 1078">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 1078 1696 1117">Environmental Justice &amp; ADA</td> <td data-bbox="1696 1078 1911 1117">Equity</td> <td data-bbox="1911 1078 2040 1117">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 1117 1696 1156">Level of Environmental Impacts</td> <td data-bbox="1696 1117 1911 1156">Equity</td> <td data-bbox="1911 1117 2040 1156">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 1156 1696 1195">Economic Benefits</td> <td data-bbox="1696 1156 1911 1195">Equity</td> <td data-bbox="1911 1156 2040 1195">1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="701 1268 782 1295">-James</p>	Criteria	Focus	Weight	Addresses Safety Issue	System Upkeep	4	Deliverability	System Upkeep	3	Level of Consistency With Other Adopted Plans or Studies	System Upkeep	3	Preservation of Existing Facility	System Upkeep	2	Operational Improvements	System Upkeep	2	Improve the Existing Transportation System Through TSM, TDM or ITS Strategies.	System Upkeep	1				Regional Connections	Connectivity	4	System Connectivity (Motorized & non-Motorized)	Connectivity	3	Bicycle Route/Trail Use	Connectivity	2	Transit Access	Connectivity	2	Sidewalk Use	Connectivity	2				Level of Community Impacts	Equity	4	Environmental Justice & ADA	Equity	3	Level of Environmental Impacts	Equity	2	Economic Benefits	Equity	1
Criteria	Focus	Weight																																																							
Addresses Safety Issue	System Upkeep	4																																																							
Deliverability	System Upkeep	3																																																							
Level of Consistency With Other Adopted Plans or Studies	System Upkeep	3																																																							
Preservation of Existing Facility	System Upkeep	2																																																							
Operational Improvements	System Upkeep	2																																																							
Improve the Existing Transportation System Through TSM, TDM or ITS Strategies.	System Upkeep	1																																																							
Regional Connections	Connectivity	4																																																							
System Connectivity (Motorized & non-Motorized)	Connectivity	3																																																							
Bicycle Route/Trail Use	Connectivity	2																																																							
Transit Access	Connectivity	2																																																							
Sidewalk Use	Connectivity	2																																																							
Level of Community Impacts	Equity	4																																																							
Environmental Justice & ADA	Equity	3																																																							
Level of Environmental Impacts	Equity	2																																																							
Economic Benefits	Equity	1																																																							
24 May 2017	Lance Ahern	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	I am surprised the plan/criteria does not include any components related to upcoming intelligent and automated vehicles (cars and trucks) which are going to be dominant long before 2040. While the Criteria includes, "Improve the existing transportation system efficiency..." this is described strictly in terms of top-down government managed services, rather than distributed and bottom-up commercial and crowd-sourced services. I also reviewed all the recent state and local transit and freight management plans and none include any discussion of the impact of self-driving vehicles.																																																						

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
25 May 2017	Kurt Rein	General Comment	<p><b>From:</b> Wood, Katherine  <b>Sent:</b> Thursday, May 25, 2017 10:41 AM  <b>To:</b> Underwood, Vivian R.; McPherson, John; AMATS Info  <b>Subject:</b> RE: MTP Trans Fair // Public Comment follow up</p> <p>Kurt Rein, xxx-xxxx</p> <p>On my fourth try, I connected with Kurt who asked for a call back from a Listening Post. He doesn't have a computer, internet access, or an email address. Here is Kurt's general comment: We are spending billions of dollars upgrading highways—you can't accommodate cars anymore. We need to move to public transportation. We need rail transit, perhaps in the air (in highway medians) like they have in Singapore and Kuala Lumpur. We need more buses with good schedules and not transfers that cost more. Instead of spending billions on autos, we should be spending money on transit. We need to do more input and have comment period during the planning process, not at the end of the meeting. Kurt requested a sit-down meeting to talk further.</p> <p>I told Kurt about our upcoming public meetings as the best chance to learn more about the project and provide comments, but he asked me to send him information in the mail. We will send him the Fact Sheet, FAQs, and a copy of the meeting notice flyer.</p> <p>His mailing address is:            xxxx xxxxxx xxxxxx            Anchorage, AK xxxxx</p>
1 June 2017	Cheryl Richardson	General Comment	<p><b>From:</b> Cheryl Richardson  <b>Date:</b> Thu, Jun 1, 2017 at 8:37 PM  <b>Subject:</b> Craig, a quick question please,  <b>To:</b> "Lyon, Craig H."  <b>Cc:</b> "Hart, Hal H"</p> <p>I'm not clear why the MTP's goals and objectives are not up for public review along with the project screening criteria?</p> <p>It seems like putting the cart before the horse to adopt screening criteria when the goals and objectives are still in draft form.</p> <p>You said they would remain in draft form until approved by the Policy Committee in 2019?</p> <p>Thank you,            Cheryl</p>
6 Jun 2017	Nancy Pease	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	<p><b>From:</b> Wood, Katherine  <b>Sent:</b> Tuesday, June 06, 2017 4:57 PM</p>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p><b>To:</b> Underwood, Vivian R.; Lyon, Craig H.; AMATS Info  <b>Cc:</b> McPherson, John; Cummings, Laurie  <b>Subject:</b> MTP 2040 // Phone call</p> <p>Nancy called to ask if there was any supporting memo or documentation to provide more context and information on the Screening Criteria that is out for public comment by 6/10. She felt that there was not sufficient information provided about how the criteria would be used, what they mean, and who will decide on them, and that the lack of information made it difficult to comment on them (i.e., how will the transit criteria correspond to the recent transit planning? Does community impacts mean noise, emissions, visuals? How will operational improvements be measured?). I told her we were working on a memo 1B, that had background information on the screening criteria, and we would publish it and let people know when that was available. She requested that the comment deadline be changed (2-3 weeks after the memo is published) to allow the council enough time to provide meaningful, informed comments.</p>
7 Jun 2017	Steve Heimel	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	<p><b>From:</b> Steve &amp; Johanna  <b>Sent:</b> Wednesday, June 07, 2017 4:33 PM  <b>To:</b> AMATS Info  <b>Cc:</b> Cheryl Richardson  <b>Subject:</b> Screening criteria for projects</p> <p>Dear AMATS members:</p> <p>I am informed that AMATS will act to approve screening criteria for projects. I appreciate the opportunity to comment about these criteria. I have been attending the public meetings put on by Alaska Common Ground. After reading through them, I support the criteria for transit and non motorized projects. Safety, connectivity and encouraging increased use are good criteria.</p> <p>Table 2-1 seems to continue encouraging existing practices, building more high capacity roads that are difficult to cross with non motorized methods. Under "regional connections" I particularly consider the high rating for new arterial expressway or freeway to be unwise. We already have too many of those. Our city is infilling and needs to look toward more density, better mass transit and increased options for non motorized use. The T2 rating for that is bad weighting. When it comes to the "roadway connectivity" criterion, I see a similar problem. If we are infilling toward residential and employment centers, do we really want to encourage breaking these centers up with new roads and more traffic? So it seems to me to be a bad idea to give the greatest weight to "new connection," and even greater weight to "closing a gap of 1/2 mile or more." Sometimes a 1/2 mile gap can be a good thing.</p> <p>Thank you for any consideration given to my concerns. We all need to look toward spending our federal transportation money more wisely, with an eye toward a sustainable future for our community. I would be pleased to be more involved in open and transparent AMATS proceedings in the future.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			Steve Heimel
7 Jun 2017	Gretchen Nelson	General Comment	<p><b>From:</b> Gretchen Nelson  <b>Sent:</b> Wednesday, June 07, 2017 3:36 PM  <b>To:</b> AMATS Info  <b>Subject:</b> Smart transportation policy for Anchorage</p> <p>Dear committee members,</p> <p>Our municipality transportation resources should be used carefully and wisely to make Anchorage a better place to live. We can be a great year round city but we need to move beyond single, mega transportation projects that disregard important community values found in the Anchorage 2020 plan. It is time for action to be based on the values of Anchorage residents with transportation planning, decisions and spending focused on making it safe and easy to walk, bike or ride a bus in the city.</p> <p>I expect that AMATS will work to create transportation and land use policy which will improve Anchorage's economic prosperity, protect open spaces and natural areas, support active communities, ensure safe and reliable travel choices, and most importantly reduce reliance on car travel to improve our quality of life.</p> <p>Thank you for your work to better our community,  Gretchen Nelson</p>
7 Jun 2017	Joan Diamond	General Comment	<p><b>From:</b> Joan Diamond  <b>Sent:</b> Wednesday, June 07, 2017 8:20 PM  <b>To:</b> AMATS Info  <b>Subject:</b> Change status quo</p> <p>Please make every effort to make the transportation changes that will promote pedestrian and bicycle transportation. We need to make every effort to make Anchorage a more livable city, less noise and improve the ability to get to work and play without driving a car. We can learn from all the mistakes made by other cities like Seattle.</p> <p>Joan Diamond  public transit at shorter intervals,  Sent from my iPhone</p>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
7 Jun 2017	Cheryl Richardson	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	<p><b>From:</b> Cheryl Richardson  <b>Sent:</b> Wednesday, June 07, 2017 5:35 PM  <b>To:</b> AMATS Info  <b>Cc:</b> Hart, Hal H; Schutte, Christopher M  <b>Subject:</b> Please consider these the Citizens Coalition's preliminary comments on AMATS proposed Project Screening Criteria.</p> <p>Please note that we find it a breach in the public's right to meaningful, timely participation in decision-making to release AMATS' screening criteria in such a dense, technical format on May 11, with virtually no context in terms of how the MTP affects Anchorage's growth and development twenty years from now.</p> <p>We submit these comments today because we understand that while comments are officially due at 5pm, June 10, 2017, AMATS' initial vote to accept or modify the criteria will be held June 8, with a follow up telephone vote before Monday, June 12.</p> <p>BEGIN:  <b>Anchorage is finally in a position to reshape its transportation systems to build a great winter city.</b> Hopefully, this is the year we can get beyond "business as usual" and use the hundreds of millions we spend on transportation to bring positive changes to our community.</p> <p>At the same time Anchorage is rewriting its 20 year Metropolitan Transportation Plan, People Mover will shift its routes to concentrate on the city's urban core with buses coming every 15 minutes. Anchorage's forthcoming Land Use Plan strongly emphasizes infill and redevelopment, walking, biking and transit, as well as "placemaking" to bring in more homeowners through infill and redevelopment, while making the urban core more attractive to families and visitors.</p> <p><b>AMATS' transportation resources must be used wisely to make Anchorage a better place to live</b> -- a great winter city. We need to move beyond stand alone transportation projects that bypass or ignore community values found in Anchorage 2020.</p> <p>Now is the time for Anchorage's overarching community values to determine transportation thinking, planning and spending.</p> <p><b>The MTP needs a strong purpose statement</b> beyond "this updates AMATS Metropolitan Transportation Plan."  ACC recommends:</p> <p>The MTP will integrate transportation and land use efforts to improve Anchorage's economic competitiveness and prosperity, protect open spaces and natural areas, promote vibrant communities, provide safe and reliable travel choices, decrease reliance on car travel and enhance our quality of life.</p>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>Community resources, including transportation, are expected to pursue policies and projects that contribute to that vision.</p> <p><b>This purpose statement must be followed by consistent policies and practices</b>, that have been noticeably absent in Anchorage's transportation planning and spending.</p> <p>When AMATS selects projects for funding, we should expand the usual criteria of adding lanes, reducing congestion and project readiness - - to include measurable outcomes for community goals such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Reduce household transportation costs,</li> <li>· Add economic value and activity to neighborhoods and commercial centers,</li> <li>· Contribute to compact urban development, i.e.: serves employment centers, schools, parks and community facilities,</li> <li>· Safe and reliable mobility,</li> <li>· Provide transportation choices,</li> <li>· Improve human health by more activity and less pollution,</li> <li>· Clean air and water,</li> <li>· Reduce greenhouse gases,</li> <li>· Impact those with low incomes, limited English proficiency, no access to an automobile, or those over age 65,</li> <li>· Impact areas of high latent demand,</li> <li>· Maintain "State of Good Repair."</li> </ul> <p><b>Please include these examples of measurable objectives that derive from Anchorage's community wide goals found in Anchorage 2020.</b> ACC can provide examples of data bases that other communities use to calculate comparable outcomes.</p> <p><b>A. Economic Prosperity</b> - Current and future residents benefit from Anchorage's sustained economic competitiveness and prosperity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Attract new businesses and family-wage jobs, and retain those that are already here.</li> <li>· Increase access to jobs by all modes.</li> <li>· Improve access to jobs for both residents and employers.</li> <li>· Provide for the efficient movement of goods by both rail and truck and support multi-modal freight transportation.</li> </ul> <p><b>B. Vibrant Neighborhoods and Community Centers</b> - People live, work and play in vibrant neighborhoods where their everyday needs are easily accessible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Support the preservation and production of affordable housing in the city.</li> <li>· Reduce the amount of land dedicated to vehicle parking by providing for and encouraging alternative ways to travel.</li> <li>· Prioritize transportation projects that enable active, healthy communities.</li> <li>· New projects respect the character and plans of neighborhoods.</li> </ul>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Use transportation investments to reinforce growth in and multi-modal access to 2040 City and Town Centers and ensure that development in those areas is consistent with and supports transportation investments.</li> </ul> <p><b>C. Safe and Reliable Transportation</b> - People have safe and reliable transportation choices that enhance their quality of life.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Achieve targets for increased walking, bicycling, use of transit and shared ride and reduced reliance on the automobile and drive alone trips.</li> <li>· Reduce vehicle miles traveled per capita.</li> <li>· Provide affordable and equitable access to travel choices and serve the needs of all people and businesses, including people with low income, children, elders and people with disabilities to connect with jobs, education, services, recreation, social and cultural activities.</li> </ul> <p><b>D. Reduced Greenhouse Gases</b> - Anchorage and its transportation system leads in minimizing contributions to climate change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions.</li> <li>· Prioritize environmentally sustainable projects using a sensible, balanced approach.</li> </ul> <p><b>E. Clean Air and Water</b> - Current and future generations enjoy clean air, clean water and healthy wildlife habitats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Reduce transportation-related energy and land consumption and the region’s dependence on unstable energy sources.</li> <li>· Protect the region’s water quality and natural stream flows.</li> </ul> <p><b>F. Equity</b> - The benefits and burdens of growth and change are distributed equitably.            Reduce the share of households in the region spending more than 50 percent of household income on housing and transportation combined.            Promote equity of all people independent of age, race, ethnicity, economic status, and physical ability.            Create and implement context-sensitive design standards.</p> <p><b>G. Enhance Human Health</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provide safe, comfortable and convenient transportation options that support active living and physical activity to meet daily needs and access services.</li> <li>· Minimize noise, impervious surface and other transportation-related pollution impacts on residents in the region.</li> </ul> <p><b>H. Ensure Fiscal Stewardship</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Transportation planning and investment decisions ensure the best return on public investments in infrastructure and programs and are guided by data and analyses.</li> <li>· Fund and maintain the existing transportation system adequately.</li> <li>· Select new projects that can be efficiently maintained.</li> <li>· Adequately update, repair and maintain transportation facilities and services to preserve their function, maintain their useful life and eliminate maintenance backlogs.</li> <li>· Make transportation investment decisions that use public resources effectively and efficiently, using a performance-based planning approach supported by data and analyses that include all transportation modes.</li> </ul>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>· Stabilize existing transportation revenue while securing new and innovative long-term sources of funding adequate to build, operate and maintain the transportation system for all modes of travel.</p>
8 Jun 2017	Cindee Karns	General Comment	<p><b>From:</b> Cindee Karns  <b>Sent:</b> Thursday, June 08, 2017 8:35 AM  <b>To:</b> AMATS Info  <b>Subject:</b> COMMENTS  <b>Hi---</b>                      Now is the time for Anchorage's overarching community values to determine transportation thinking, planning and spending. It's a time of transition. We need to have a STRONG transportation system, not the same-ol'-same-ol'.                      We need to think about how to tighten up our service. One GREAT way to do that would be to take over the school bus contract from the School District and run public busses instead. It would help get adults into town from the outlying areas and it would help discipline on the busses. Kids could then do after school activities as well. This would only strengthen our community.                      Without taxis in Eagle River/Chuigiak the outlying communities would feel less isolated as the population out here ages. In addition, the busses in neighborhoods would increase the community feel.                      We need a strong transportation system IN TOWN so that once a bus comes in from Eagle River, folks can move around easily. If downtown and midtown public transportation doesn't increase, there's no sense in bringing the suburb folks in to town.                      PLEASE consider these comments. The age of the car is over. Cars need to be taxed for the carbon they are putting out. Anchorage needs to comply with the Paris Accords and work towards lowering all carbon emissions.                      Thanks,                      Cindee Karns                      Eagle River, AK</p>
8 Jun 2017	Nora Gecan	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	<p><b>From:</b> Nora Gecan  <b>Sent:</b> Thursday, June 08, 2017 10:30 AM  <b>To:</b> AMATS Info  <b>Subject:</b> Comments on: Project Screening Criteria                      Hello,                      As a resident of Anchorage who hopes that this city can become even better through transportation planning, I strongly support Alaska Trail's comments on the MTP Project Screening Criteria, listed below:  <b>1. AMATS' transportation resources must be used wisely to make Anchorage a better place to live</b> -- a great winter city. We need to move beyond stand alone transportation projects that bypass or ignore community values found in Anchorage 2020.                        Now is the time for Anchorage's overarching community values to determine transportation thinking, planning and spending.    <b>Background:</b></p>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>On May 11, 2017, AMATS released project Screening Criteria (Attachment 1, 5B, Table 2.1, page 5) for public comment. While proposed Goals, Objectives and Performance Criteria were simply "approved" at the same meeting, they are also worthy of your scrutiny and comment (Attachment 2, 5A, see Table 4.1, page 19.)</p> <p><b>2. The MTP needs a strong purpose statement such as:</b>                      The MTP will integrate transportation and land use efforts to improve Anchorage's economic competitiveness and prosperity, protect open spaces and natural areas, promote vibrant communities, provide safe and reliable travel choices, decrease reliance on car travel and enhance our quality of life.</p> <p>Community resources, including transportation, are expected to pursue policies and projects that contribute to that vision.</p> <p><b>3. When AMATS selects projects for funding, they should expand the usual criteria</b> of - - adding lanes, reducing congestion and project readiness - - to include measurable outcomes for community goals such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce household transportation costs,</li> <li>• Add economic value and activity to neighborhoods and commercial centers,</li> <li>• Contribute to compact urban development, i.e.: serves employment centers, schools, parks and community facilities,</li> <li>• Safe and reliable mobility,</li> <li>• Provide transportation choices,</li> <li>• Improve human health by more activity and less pollution,</li> <li>• Clean air and water,</li> <li>• Reduce greenhouse gases,</li> <li>• Impact those with low incomes, limited English proficiency, no access to an automobile, or those over age 65,</li> <li>• Impact areas of high latent demand,</li> <li>• Maintain "State of Good Repair."</li> </ul> <p><b>4. Here are examples of measurable objectives that derive from Anchorage's community wide goals.</b></p> <p><b>A. Economic Prosperity</b> - Current and future residents benefit from Anchorage's sustained economic competitiveness and prosperity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attract new businesses and family-wage jobs, and retain those that are already here.</li> <li>• Increase access to jobs by all modes.</li> <li>• Improve access to jobs for both residents and employers.</li> <li>• Provide for the efficient movement of goods by both rail and truck and support multi-modal freight transportation.</li> </ul> <p><b>B. Vibrant Neighborhoods and Community Centers</b> - People live, work and play in vibrant neighborhoods where their everyday needs are easily accessible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the preservation and production of affordable housing in the region.</li> </ul>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce the amount of land dedicated to vehicle parking by providing for and encouraging alternative ways to travel.</li> <li>• Prioritize transportation projects that enable active, healthy communities.</li> <li>• New projects respect the character and plans of cities, neighborhoods, and adjacent communities.</li> <li>• Use transportation investments to reinforce growth in and multi-modal access to 2040 City and Town Centers and ensure that development in those areas is consistent with and supports the transportation investments.</li> </ul> <p><b>C. Safe and Reliable Transportation</b> - People have safe and reliable transportation choices that enhance their quality of life.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achieve targets for increased walking, bicycling, use of transit and shared ride and reduced reliance on the automobile and drive alone trips.</li> <li>• Reduce vehicle miles traveled per capita.</li> <li>• Provide affordable and equitable access to travel choices and serve the needs of all people and businesses, including people with low income, children, elders and people with disabilities to connect with jobs, education, services, recreation, social and cultural activities.</li> </ul> <p><b>D. Reduced Greenhouse Gases</b> - Anchorage and its transportation system leads in minimizing contributions to climate change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions.</li> <li>• Prioritize environmentally sustainable projects using a sensible, balanced approach.</li> </ul> <p><b>E. Clean Air and Water</b> - Current and future generations enjoy clean air, clean water and healthy wildlife habitats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce transportation-related energy and land consumption and the region’s dependence on unstable energy sources.</li> <li>• Protect the region’s water quality and natural stream flows.</li> </ul> <p><b>F. Equity</b> - The benefits and burdens of growth and change are distributed equitably.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote equity of all people independent of age, race, ethnicity, economic status, and physical ability.</li> <li>• Create and implement context-sensitive design standards.</li> <li>• Reduce the share of households in the region spending more than 50 percent of household income on housing and transportation combined.</li> </ul> <p><b>G. Enhance Human Health</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide safe, comfortable and convenient transportation options that support active living and physical activity to meet daily needs and access services.</li> <li>• Minimize noise, impervious surface and other transportation-related pollution impacts on residents in the region.</li> </ul> <p><b>H. Ensure Fiscal Stewardship</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transportation planning and investment decisions ensure the best return on public investments in infrastructure and programs and are guided by data and analyses.</li> <li>• Fund and maintain the existing transportation system adequately.</li> <li>• Select new projects that can be efficiently maintained.</li> </ul>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequately update, repair and maintain transportation facilities and services to preserve their function, maintain their useful life and eliminate maintenance backlogs.</li> <li>• Make transportation investment decisions that use public resources effectively and efficiently, using a performance-based planning approach supported by data and analyses that include all transportation modes.</li> <li>• Stabilize existing transportation revenue while securing new and innovative long-term sources of funding adequate to build, operate and maintain the regional transportation system for all modes of travel at the federal, state, regional and local level.</li> </ul> <p>Best,</p> <p>Nora Gecan</p>
8 Jun 2017	Meredith Noble	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	<p><b>From:</b> Meredith Noble  <b>Sent:</b> Thursday, June 08, 2017 11:42 AM  <b>To:</b> AMATS Info  <b>Cc:</b> Ryan Witten; anchoragecitizenscoalition@gmail.com  <b>Subject:</b> Comments on Project Screening Process</p> <p>Hi AMATS,</p> <p>Below are our comments on Technical Memorandum #1B, Screening.</p> <p>With such short notice, we didn't have time to thoroughly review Technical Memo 1a: Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures, but we align our comments with those shared by the Anchorage Citizen's Coalition.</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> <u>Please consider delaying approval of the screening criteria (referenced in Attachment 1 – 5B) on Monday, June 12<sup>th</sup>.</u> The screening criteria is not refined enough to adequately rank projects and outreach was unsatisfactory for feedback. Our main concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· All transportation projects should be planned for multi-modal use and therefore, all three project types should be considered together into a singular matrix (i.e. Tables 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5);</li> <li>· The criteria should be much more specific (comments below), specifically how the project aligns with Anchorage’s forthcoming Land Use Plan and its emphasis on infill and redevelopment, walking, biking and transit.</li> <li>· A benefit-cost analysis (BCA) should be required for each project (and we suspect adding this could help shorten the matrix). The methodology for conducting the BCA should be described by AMATS so you can clearly compare project to project with measurable outputs.</li> </ul> <p>If you are willing to delay approval, we vow to work hard to help you with outreach and participation in refining the screening criteria. We would ask that you consider delaying until late July at the earliest.</p>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p><b>Specific Comments:</b></p> <p><b>Table 2.1:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Why are operational improvements first? This is business as usual of moving cars as quickly as possible – neglecting adjacent land use considerations and other modes of transit.</li> <li>· Added road infrastructure and regional connections is not inherently ‘good’, especially with our inability to maintain the existing network, high operation and construction costs, and the impact to our community. We propose:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o +2: Preservation to the existing network or makes system improvements for non-motorized users.</li> <li>o +1: Full-rehabilitation on the existing network.</li> <li>o 0: No change</li> <li>o -1: New system infrastructure.</li> </ul> </li> <li>· Bicycle Route/Trail connectivity needs to be separated into two categories. Bicycle infrastructure within the road way is significantly different than recreational trails for all user types. Walkers and fast-speed bicyclists are conflicting users. Most utility bicyclists want to be in the road, at minimum with a painted bike lane, and preferably a protected bike lane if only by a small buffer like a curb between vehicle traffic and the bike lane. At the bare minimum – the bicycle route question should give points:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o +2: Adds protected bike infrastructure;</li> <li>o +1: Adds painted bike lanes;</li> <li>o 0: No bike lane improvements</li> <li>o -1: No bicycle route improvements</li> </ul> </li> <li>· The trail connectivity could rate:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o +2: Completes a trail system disconnect</li> <li>o +1: Preserves existing trail network</li> <li>o 0: No trail improvements</li> <li>o -1: Impedes trail connections or routes for non-motorized users</li> </ul> </li> <li>· Not clear what you mean by measuring transit connections. Should measure how many people the bus network on the project location serves, or could serve at full infill development.</li> <li>· Need more info on the quality of sidewalk connections, like does it have a separation between the road if the adjacent road is over 35 mph? Is it planned to account for snow removal and still be operational in the winter? Does it include new trees, or stormwater low-impact development techniques, etc. Does it support economic/commercial development (i.e. wide enough to allow outside seating, bike racks, outside retail displays, etc.) These factors should be considered in the rating criteria.</li> <li>· Environmental Impacts should weight positive environmental considerations:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o +2: Positive impact with reduced congestion (air quality), LID management of stormwater</li> <li>o +1: No impacts anticipated</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· What does level of community impact mean? Anything above zero points should be positive impact. The current rating criteria implies that transportation projects have a negative impact when a well-designed complete street and multi-modal solution can have a positive impact on a community. A benefit cost analysis would help quantify this information.</li> <li>· Environmental Justice and ADA should not be combined.</li> <li>· Safety is a big topic! It's tough to just give this one category, but perhaps consider rewording the rating criteria to more specifically define a safe transportation project:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o +2: documented accidents/fatalities at this project location and the project is designed to mitigate it.</li> <li>o +1: Project has technology and/or design elements in it to improve safety.</li> </ul> </li> <li>· Really happy to see TSM, TDM, and ITS in there. It could be better embedded into a safety rating criteria and a congestion management criteria.</li> <li>· Specifically articulate the plans a project should align with, then points go to the project base on how well it supports criteria in each specific plan.</li> <li>· Economic benefits – Is the project economically viable or supports surrounding economic development? Not clear, so this may need to be two categories. The BCA would make this an easier issue to measure to account for economic considerations like future land value, reduced deaths/accidents, job creation, etc.</li> <li>· Should include a category for consideration to O&amp;M costs and payment.</li> <li>· More points should be given to system preservation!! (This is addressed in bullet 2)</li> </ul> <p>Table 2-4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Should include public support category</li> <li>· Specific language on how it supports high density development</li> </ul> <p>Table 2-5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Positive public support should be worth 5 pts, some known outreach worth 3.</li> <li>· Inclusion in plans needs to be more specific.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concluding Comments:</b> With such short notice, we didn't have time to give more thorough comments, but hope you will consider delaying final approval of the project screening process for another 4-6 weeks. Please combine all tables into a singular matrix so projects are compared against each other and multi-modal projects are encouraged. Please add a BCA to the decision making process. Thank you so much!</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Meredith Noble Anchorage Citizen</p>
8 Jun 2017	Daniel Jacks	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	<p><b>From:</b> Daniel Jacks <b>Sent:</b> Thursday, June 08, 2017 3:00 PM</p>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p><b>To:</b> AMATS Info  <b>Subject:</b> Proposed Project Screening Criteria Comment</p> <p>Hello,  I'd like to comment on the proposed AMATS project screening criteria.</p> <p>Please excuse my ignorance about the topic, but the matrix appears to be a method by which qualitative project outcomes can be converted to quantitative scores. It seems like a blunt instrument with a lot of room for subjectivity to come into play.(maybe that's the point - the website is not clear about that). Wouldn't it be worthwhile to be a little more thorough on estimating the impacts of a project and derive some sort of cost/benefit score, so projects can be objectively ranked? It would be rough, but using a consistent methodology to estimate the numbers (using planning level construction costs, travel demand model outputs, crash modification factors, etc) would provide a more accurate measure by which to compare the merits of projects. In other words, maybe we should spend a little more up front on better screening criteria to ensure the projects we're approving actually further the MTP's goals.</p> <p>About the proposed criteria:</p> <p>Regional Connections Criteria: Using the length of regional connector as a screening criteria doesn't appear to align with any of the goals. Who cares how long a new connector is, as long as it reduces travel time, congestion, and/or crashes? I would make this into a [yes/no/no effect] criteria.  System Connectivity: This can mean different things. Is it new links? Is it holes in medians? Frankly most of the access management projects done in town have negatively affected this measure.</p> <p>Consider: Since emission reduction is part of the proposed 2040 MTP goals, perhaps an emissions per mile traveled MOE would be useful. Note this is NOT per vehicle-mile traveled. This would support projects that reduce delay and/or increase non-automobile travel.</p> <p>I also want to add that I don't appreciate the fact that you're "conditionally approving" the screening criteria at today's TAC meeting before the end of the comment period. This stuff is already difficult for the public to comprehend and is not well advertised. This voting shenanigans makes the public involvement seem even less relevant to your process.  Thank you!</p> <p>Daniel Jacks</p>
8 Jun 2017	Kim Varner Wetzel	General Comment	<p><b>From:</b> Kimberly Wetzel  <b>Sent:</b> Thursday, June 08, 2017 6:27 PM  <b>To:</b> AMATS Info  <b>Subject:</b> MTP mobile website comments</p>

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>A few comments:                      I would test the mobile version of your website a bit more. I couldn't use the comment form and had trouble reading the fact pages because they kept cycling and I couldn't read one at a time.                      I have small kids and can't attend meetings these days. Could you provide specific questions or survey to collect comments? Otherwise I lack a meaningful way to give input because there are no documents on your website. In any transportation planning document- I can't stress how important it is to plan for a reduced level of service. We cant afford to build so that every single car driver waits 0 minutes at lights. This is an insane expectation. I liked the info graphics. I suggest applying the population and worker estimates to the other graphics. For example, do we expect at-home employment to increase? If our plan added rail or more trails, would other modes increase? It would be really exciting to create sliding scales so people could play with how investments in non-highway infrastructure (e.g. Connector streets, a viable grid, breaking super blocks) could extend the life of our highway.                      Good luck in your work!                      Kim Varner Wetzel</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>
8 Jun 2017	Joel Gaines	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	<p><b>From:</b> Joel Gaines  <b>Sent:</b> Thursday, June 08, 2017 10:05 PM  <b>To:</b> Underwood, Vivian R.  <b>Subject:</b> Re: 2040 MTP Draft Tech Memo 1B: Screening</p> <p>Vivian,</p> <p>Thank you so much for your help and patience.                      Received it just in time to get it to the community council meeting.                      The chair of our council's land and transportation committee, Nancy Pease, was tasked to share the group's concern about the short turnaround of the June 10 comment-period deadline.                      I asked her to call you for a firsthand explanation, and to see whether a deadline extension might be approved.                      Thanks again for your help and for including us in the process.                      Joel Gaines "A Change is Gonna Come" Sam Cooke, 1964</p>
9 Jun 2017	Karen Ruud/Peter Mjos, MD	General Comment	<p><b>From:</b> Karen Ruud  <b>Sent:</b> Friday, June 09, 2017 9:36 AM  <b>To:</b> AMATS Info  <b>Subject:</b> transportation comments</p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam:</p>

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>I strongly support an Anchorage that realizes the vision of the Anchorage 2020, Promoting our natural resources and parks, livable and vibrant communities, the arts, transportation which is not solely reliant on vehicles, but with ever greater emphasis on Efficient modes-bikes, walkability, mass transit-those which contribute to attractive communities, vibrancy, and are proven to attract businesses, raise our economy and prosperity. TRAILS make great cities. Fact. We know that trails create healthy populations. We must never again slice, divide, and decimate neighborhoods for Larger and faster roadways, which truly subjugate neighborhoods to and deterioration.</p> <p>We also know that air pollution, particularly diesel and ultra-fine particulates, can lead to devastating and lasting health consequences.</p> <p>Planning must return to the concept of village centers and neighborhood respect.</p> <p>It is time that Anchorage embrace multi-modal transportation such as bus rapid transit (BRT), ride sharing, and encouraging LNG and electric vehicles. And continue to explore light rail to and from the Valley. Much of the demand for more road expansion is for Valley residents who work in Anchorage but choose to live In the Valley, pay no Anchorage property tax, but demand that Anchorage provide easy and rapid driveability. It is time that non Anchorage residents contribute.</p> <p>Reduce our excessive massive paved parking lots. This is the antithesis of modern planning.</p> <p>Recognize transportation planning which encourages community, densification, and in-filling, done with imagination and creativity, and utilizing photo voltaics such as we see in Mountain View.</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to join this very exciting venture.</p> <p>Peter Mjos, MD Sent from my iPad</p>
9 June 2017	Nancy Pease	General Comment	<p><b>From:</b> Nancy Pease <b>Sent:</b> Friday, June 09, 2017 8:45 AM <b>To:</b> Underwood, Vivian R. <b>Subject:</b> Who should receive comment letter from RCCC on MTP 2040?</p> <p>Hello, Vivian, as just noted in our phone conversation, Rabbit Creek Community Council will submit comments on the draft screening criteria by June 10, and will note that the table of criteria does not give enough information for meaningful public comment.</p> <p>We will send this by e-mailed letter, rather than the online comment survey form.</p> <p>Please send me the names and or emails of the appropriate recipients, whom I assume include Katherine Underwood and Craig Lyon.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
9 Jun 2017	Kay Sind	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	<p><b>From:</b> Kay Sind <b>Sent:</b> Friday, June 09, 2017 8:21 AM <b>To:</b> AMATS Info <b>Cc:</b> AnchorageCitizensCoalition@gmail.org <b>Subject:</b> AMAT Project Screening Criteria</p> <p>Hello,</p>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>I very recently became aware that there is a public comment period for the Project Screening Criteria.</p> <p>I'm excited that there is a lot of thought being put into the transportation projects that will shape Anchorage in the coming years. Without having worked a project specific to a MTP or with AMAT, I can't say with too much certainty what will make for a fair and useful screening criteria system. However, since I live in Anchorage and need to commute, I will provide a couple comments to speak to my concerns.</p> <p>1- On bicycle connectivity and sidewalk connectivity: My first concern here is that on a lot of the routes, it seems that if there is any bicycle/sidewalk option, they are often one in the same, which isn't safe. I could ramble on for a long time about all the near misses I've had trying to bike commute, but I would like to make sure that a plan wouldn't be considered sufficiently connecting sidewalk and bike paths with just one pathway, because the two should be separate.</p> <p>My other main comment on the bicycle connectivity criteria is that it specify's +2 if it connects a gap by a 1/2 mile or more. I'm not sure of the intent of using the 1/2 mile; however, I just want to point out that the gaps that are less than a 1/2 mile are also important to address if we want bikers to feel safe and encouraged to bike commute. When commuting, if the rider needs to go through scary traffic or narrow sidewalks or even if the route isn't clear, for even a couple blocks- it could deter many people from riding and cause a lot of accidents. My main point is that it is important for the whole commute to be connected- door to door.</p> <p>2- on environmental impact. I thought it was interesting that the +2 category here was defined as having no impact, instead of having the potential for having a positive impact on the environment. I understand that everything impacts the environment, but I think if we think about the environmental impact as being relative to the transportation status quo, then we might be able to have a criteria that could encourage forward thought.</p> <p>This comment applies to community impact as well. I certainly think transportation could positively impact a community, and I think we should be thinking about enhancing instead of doing the least amount of harm.</p> <p>Finally, I am okay with the scale, because I understand that the work neutral is just intended to mean no change, which is normal. However, when I think about Anchorage spending more money and making changes to our transportation, it seems like no change is actually worse than neutral, because it seems like there should be an expected continuous improvement. For example, if we are spending money on a new road, then yes- the situation is neutral; however, if we are putting in new roads, then it feels worse than neutral if the roads aren't improved if there are pre-identified issues.</p> <p>Thank you for listening to my concerns. I appreciate all the effort being put into the MTP. I intend to stay involved and look forward to the transportation changes coming.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kay</p>
9 Jun 2017	Carol Wong	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Regional Connections: What about "Local Connections?" The more people can localize their trips through different travel modes, the less pavement/row required.

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
9 Jun 2017	Carol Wong	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	System Connectivity (Motorized and Non-Motorized): This criteria when coupled with regional, bicycle, trail, transit, seems to allow the potential for double scoring of these transportation concepts/modes in comparison to other criteria.
9 Jun 2017	Carol Wong	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Sidewalk Use: +1 rather than "n/a" what about "improves functionality" so projects that are widening or moves a hydrant or light pole out of the middle of a sidewalk are credited.
9 Jun 2017	Carol Wong	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Level of Environmental Impacts: air and noise should be included as consideration
9 Jun 2017	Carol Wong	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Level of Community Impacts: The footnote should include consideration of CPTED concepts, as well as the project lends itself to place making and fulfilling street typology goals.
9 Jun 2017	Carol Wong	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Environmental Justice and ADA: Age (not everyone walks at the same speed nor can navigate over certain types of pavements or surface treatments) and language (not everyone can read written signage, either due to language or for those visually impaired, to be able to navigate the various transp. modes) needs need to included
9 Jun 2017	Carol Wong	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Improve the existing transportation system efficiency through the implementation of effective and innovative transportation system management (TSM), transportation demand management (TDM), and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) strategies: This criteria as worded doesn't actually get to an actual improvement, perhaps it should be "Improves the existing transportation system by implementing an adopted TSM, TDM, ITS or TOD plan." This city has not seen any of these tools actually put into place, but by ranking a project that is a product of these tools, we may see more done and those that are in place will be ranked higher. I added TOD to the list because of the changes we see happening by Public Transportation as well as the designated TOD corridors will have in shaping the built environment to foster and encourage multimodal travel.
9 Jun 2017	Carol Wong	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Level of consistency with other adopted plans or studies: The Muni adopted plans and studies have been vetted through public and commission and assembly process, and should be weighted with a +5 score when the project lines up with these plans.
9 Jun 2017	Carol Wong	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Economic Benefits: A footnote should be added to explain what is meant by "economic benefit", is it a project that will spur new or redevelopment? Does it capitalize on other public dollars already invested in the project? Does it help to bring tourists or other users not normally found in the area? Does it increase property value and hence property tax?
9 Jun 2017	Carol Wong	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Preservation of Existing Facility: What is meant by this? Is this for historic trails, bridges, and to provide that acknowledgement? Or is this another "economic benefit" because it's not a new facility?
9 Jun 2017	Carol Wong	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Deliverability: With little to no State grants expected, if a project is in a neighborhood that is willing to pass a road/sidewalk/trails improvement district bond, is this the criteria that provides for that outside "match"?
9 Jun 2017	Thede Tobish	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Regional Connections: Either add Local Connections as a measurable factor here, or add it as a new discrete factor following Regional Connections
9 Jun 2017	Thede Tobish	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	System Connectivity (Motorized and Non-Motorized): The final ways to measure this will be important to consider all modes of travel
9 Jun 2017	Thede Tobish	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Improve the existing transportation system efficiency through the implementation of effective and innovative transportation system management (TSM), transportation demand management (TDM), and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) strategies: Where applicable, please add Transit Oriented (or Supportive) Development

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
9 Jun 2017	Jon Cecil	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	System Connectivity (Motorized and Non-Motorized): Suggest splitting the "System Connectivity" for Motorized and Non-motorized modes of travel as they are measured differently
9 Jun 2017	Jon Cecil	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	<p>Level of Community Impacts: Footnote #3 to this Category regarding neighborhood cohesion includes reference to "the quality of interactions among neighbors)." How is this measured? Wouldn't a more compelling measure be the physical state or the amount of poverty prevalent the neighborhood?</p> <p>Suggest adding rewording to state: "Moderate positive or negative impacts anticipated" under #1 Fair element consistent with 0 Neutral element.</p>
9 Jun 2017	Jon Cecil	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Environmental Justice and ADA: Assuming that EJ and ADA requirements are separate provisions found under Federal regulation then they should be considered as separate elements. Why are two of the screening criteria cells blank for the Neutral and Fair categories?
9 Jun 2017	Jon Cecil	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Addresses Safety Issue: The Municipality has a Vision Zero policy to reduce (eliminate) pedestrian fatalities within the MOA. Perhaps that policy direction can be woven into the evaluation criteria?
9 Jun 2017	Jon Cecil	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Improve the existing transportation system efficiency through the implementation of effective and innovative transportation system management (TSM), transportation demand management (TDM), and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) strategies: Recommend inclusion of Transit Oriented Development as another tool in the transportation system efficiency category.
9 Jun 2017	Jon Cecil	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Level of consistency with other adopted plans or studies: Rephrase this to read "Consistency with adopted land use plans and studies"
9 Jun 2017	Jon Cecil	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	Economic Benefits: Perhaps add consideration of wetlands, wildlife values
10 Jun 2017	Nancy Pease	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	<p>June 10 2017</p> <p>Municipality of Anchorage AMATS Craig Lyon, Director Vivian Underwood, Senior Planner 632 W 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue Anchorage AK 99501</p> <p>Re: Comments on MTP 2040 draft screening criteria and public comment process</p> <p>Dear Craig and Vivian:</p> <p><u>General Comments</u></p> <p>I'm requesting further written explanation of the draft screening criteria, as well as an extension of the public comment period.</p>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>The TAC is scheduled to vote on final approval for the screening criteria the same working day that it will receive public comments (June 12). That allows no time for staff analysis and follow-up with the public. It implies no serious intent to revise the screening criteria. Given that these screening criteria will be used to shape the rest of the draft MTP, informed public comment is important at this stage.</p> <p>In addition, the goals and objectives have not incorporated public concerns. A conversation with Vivian indicated that the TAC is determined to “keep moving ahead” and not become involved in public debate over goals and objectives. This intent contradicts the MTP website intent to encourage high public involvement.</p> <p>If AMATS crafts the evaluation framework (goals, objectives, screening criteria) <u>without meaningful public input, the MTP will emerge as a bureaucratic vision and not a community plan that reflects community values.</u></p> <p><u>Specific comments on screening criteria</u></p> <p>Given lack of specifics on the screening criteria, I consider these comments to be incomplete.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The term "operational improvements" is too vague to allow meaningful comment. For example, AMATS may consider higher speeds to be an “improvement”, but a neighborhood may favor traffic calming. My definition of operational improvements would include the Anchorage 2020 Comp Plan goal of reduced dependency on vehicles, and especially single-occupant vehicles.</li> <li>2. The category of "impacts [to] bicycle route/trail use" needs further explanation. I’m concerned about the safety vs. speed trade-offs of bike lines in the roadway vs. separated paths.</li> <li>3. "Sidewalk use" needs further definition. Sidewalk rating factors should include the degree of sidewalk separation relative to the vehicle speed. Back-of-curb sidewalks along a highspeed road are not safe or pleasant for pedestrians. Sidewalk ratings should also include crosswalks or other safe crossings.</li> <li>4. Air and water quality should be added to these rankings. Water quality is impacted not just by changes to drainage, but by plowed snow and other detritus from roadways.</li> <li>5. A proposed project that is inconsistent with adopted plans should get negative points. Or, it perhaps it should be disqualified.</li> <li>6. The definition of economic benefits should be expanded to consider net economic benefits over the long term. This includes the loss of developable land occupied by wide road corridors and interchanges.</li> <li>7. Parking is a major land use. A transportation plan that favors road expansion creates further parking demand and sprawl, which is contrary to our comprehensive plan. Therefore, induced parking demands should be evaluated under the screening criteria.</li> <li>8. Financial impacts is too vague for the public to comment on. Financial impacts to whom? Over what time period?</li> <li>9. Regional connectivity. This category favors long-distance commuters. Our Anchorage Comp Plan calls for infill and redevelopment and a compact land use pattern of integrated live-work-play. How do the screening criteria award points for short-distance connectivity?</li> </ol>

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>Thank you for this opportunity to comment. I hope that the TAC and staff will adopt a schedule that allows them to review, weigh, and incorporate public comments before moving to the next stage of the plan.</p> <p>Nancy Pease</p>
10 Jun 2017	Rabbit Creek Community Council	<a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	<p>June 10, 2017</p> <p>Municipality of Anchorage AMATS            Craig Lyon, Director            Vivian Underwood, Senior Planner            632 W 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue            Anchorage AK 99501</p> <p>Re: Comments on MTP 2040 Draft Screening Criteria and Public Comment Process</p> <p>Dear Craig and Vivian:</p> <p>At the June 8 meeting, Rabbit Creek Community Council (RCCC) voted to forward the following comments on the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) 2040:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RCCC requests written clarification of the draft screening criteria, extension of public comment period and postponement of Technical Advisory Committee’s vote for final approval.</li> </ol> <p>RCCC's concern is that the public process created to evaluate goals, objectives, and screening criteria may be perceived as irrelevant if the public is not allowed reasonable time for objective, persuasive input.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Certain draft screening criteria posted on the municipality website appear too ambiguous for the public to analyze objectively.</li> </ol> <p>For example, the impact of "Operational Improvements" seems open to numerous debatable interpretations if the public is provided no clarification on what the term means to municipal policymakers.</p> <p>In a rather counterintuitive response, the AMATS "Public Involvement Coordinator" indicated correspondence clarifying screening criteria is unavailable to the public.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public-comment-period schedule does not provide reasonable time for public comment.</li> </ol>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>June 8      Technical Advisory Committee voted to approve screening criteria preliminarily</p> <p>June 10      Public comments are due at 5 pm</p> <p>June 11      <i>(Sunday, non-work day)</i></p> <p>June 12      TAC votes on final approval of screening criteria</p> <p>RCCC's concern is that, from the public's perspective:</p> <p>(a) TAC will see all public comments, evaluate them, and vote on final screening criteria, all on the same day, June 12, which suggests a decision made in advance to allow no opportunity for staff analysis or discussion of particularly relevant public input <i>before TAC's final vote on the basic building blocks of a 20-year plan</i>; and</p> <p>(b) an unnecessarily abbreviated comment schedule relegates, and sets precedent for relegating, public comment to an irrelevant <i>pro forma</i> exercise, what may be reasonably perceived as a waste of citizens' time.</p> <p>4. While approved criteria may not appear as final screening criteria, the AMATS Senior Planner indicated criteria, as approved on June 12, will be applied near-term to evaluate proposed transportation projects, <i>effectively shaping the remainder of the draft MTP</i>.</p> <p>RCCC's concern is that, from the public's perspective, <i>public comment at this stage is essential</i> to refining and revising screening criteria.</p> <p>5. RCCC requests additional opportunity for comment on AMATS goals and objectives.</p> <p>RCCC's concern is that significant elements of the Comprehensive Plan are not represented in AMATS goals and objectives.</p> <p>For example, parking significantly impacts land use and transportation.</p> <p>According to "Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Plan 2020", Policy 30: "Transportation and land-use programs <i>shall</i> (emphasis added) include: ... e) optimal use of parking".</p> <p>However, AMATS goals, objectives, and draft screening criteria, are silent on parking.</p> <p>6. RCCC requests the opportunity to submit specific comments when specific screening criteria are provided.</p> <p>RCCC's concern is that unavailability of clarified screening criteria arbitrarily limits specific comments to the following:</p>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>a. The term "Operational Improvements" is too vague for focused comment or conflict resolution. A reasonable observer might conclude that, outside AMATS offices, the term may be construed to mean anything: fewer crashes, higher vehicle speeds, more stoplights, or any other quantifiable factor(s). For example, AMATS may favor higher traffic speed while a neighborhood may favor more intersections and traffic calming. In other words, the public has a clearly vested interest in having a voice on specific factors that constitute "Operational Improvements".</p> <p>b. The concept of "impacts bicycle route/trail use" requires clarification. For example, road projects may include safer bike lanes, but inadvertently create hazardous intersections. Officially listed bicycle and trail use rating factors will facilitate productive public input.</p> <p>c. The term "Sidewalk use" requires clarification to include crosswalks and other designated safe crossings.</p> <p>d. The term "community impacts" is well-defined in the footnote. This level of definition allows the public to offer relevant comments.</p> <p>e. RCCC supports the definition of community impacts as "neighborhood livability (the quality of the local environment as experienced by people who live, work or visit there) as a consequence of changes in noise, views, walking environment, land use mix and community cohesion (the quality of interactions among neighbors). "</p> <p>f. RCCC requests that "Air Quality" be included in these rankings in accordance with "Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Plan 2020", Policy 30: "Transportation and land-use programs <i>shall</i> (emphasis added) include: ...f) minimization of individual and cumulative air quality impacts."</p> <p>g. The scoring category "level of consistency with other adopted plans or studies" apparently does not allow for scoring with negative "points".</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">RCCC's concern is the risk of inaccurately scoring project proposals which are inconsistent with adopted plans.</p> <p>h. The term "economic benefits" appears to omit long-term net economic benefits.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">RCCC requests large-scale projects include a long-term cost-benefit analysis of potential citywide impacts including, for example, loss of taxable land, diminished property values, loss of wetlands, increased traffic volume, etc. versus potential benefits such as increased freight-movement capacity, potential accident reduction, etc.</p> <p>i. Parking is a significant land use created by a road-focused transportation plan.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">RCCC requests induced-parking demands be specified and added to the rating system.</p>

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>RCCC suggests reviewing other municipalities' processes for evaluating changes in parking requirements, with the possibility of including parking either in the economic cost-benefit category, or in the land-use plan-consistency category.</p> <p>j. The term "Deliverability" is too vague for focused comment.</p> <p>RCCC's concern is that "Deliverability" may overlap with "community impacts" and "economic benefits" categories.</p> <p>RCCC requests clarification of the term "financial impacts" to include who or what may be impacted.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>Again, it is respectfully requested that the AMATS public-involvement process allow TAC and staff to evaluate and include public comments before proceeding to the next stage of the plan.</p> <p>Sincerely, Adam S. Lees</p> <p>Adam Lees, Chair</p> <p>cc: Suzanne LaFrance, Anchorage Assembly John Weddleton, Anchorage Assembly</p>
9 Jun 2017	Kathie Veltre	General Comment	<p><b>From:</b> Kathryn Veltre  <b>Sent:</b> Friday, June 09, 2017 9:43 PM  <b>To:</b> AMATS Info; Cheryl Richardson  <b>Subject:</b> Anchorage transportation plan</p> <p>June 9, 2017</p> <p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>I am a long time resident who lives just steps away from Fire Island Bakery in South Addition. Our location, and maintained sidewalks make it easy and pleasant to walk to Sagaya's for groceries and downtown for restaurants and community activities.</p> <p>At the same time, I appreciate how easy it is to drive into midtown and beyond when I need to go farther afield.</p>

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>I agree with my neighbors who comment on the need to make it safer to walk across the high speed roads that bisect South Addition - especially A Street and C Street. It should be safe for a ten year old to cross those streets to catch a bus, and I do not see any agency addressing pedestrian access in a comprehensive manner.</p> <p>For those of us who are "aging in place," and may be giving up our cars in the foreseeable future, I hope someone is considering neighborhood level shuttle buses or other strategies to help us get to bus stops that are more than a quarter mile from our homes.</p> <p>I also agree that transportation projects should contribute to achieving comprehensive community goals and help build Anchorage into a great Winter City. It's time to get past "Los Anchorage" and prove that we know how to respond positively to our sub arctic location.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments, Kathie Veltre</p>
9 Jun 2017	Mary Miner, PE	General Comment	<p><b>From:</b> Mary Miner <b>Sent:</b> Friday, June 09, 2017 7:40 PM <b>To:</b> AMATS Info; Cheryl Richardson <b>Subject:</b> Comments on AMATS plan</p> <p>Due to the high costs inherent to transportation infrastructure, the AMATS plan will have a very long term impact . The AMATS plan is also one of the most important pieces of the master plan guiding what type of community Anchorage is going to be 20 years plus in the future.</p> <p>As such, it's really unfortunate that particulars on it have been released in a dense format that is very hard for 90% or more of the public to digest and with a very short turnaround.</p> <p>As a long time member of our community council, I have personal experience with DOT's transportation projects that did not include public input in the concept stage, and 15+ years on , when the project finally reached a design stage was advised that the need for bus stops had not been envisioned at the concept stage and due to ROW issues, could not now be added, despite the fact that its likely going to be another 20 years or more before a new road project will be funded.</p> <p>In reality, once a transportation project reaches the design stage of development, MOA &amp; DOT project related public meetings are just window dressing.</p> <p>Given this situation, informing the public about how important the AMATS plan is to the housing, economic and community development of Anch. and engaging the community ( community councils are a great way to get help with this) in developing the plan is imperative.</p> <p>Thank you. Mary Miner PE</p>

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			Sent from my iPhone
14 Jun 2017	Jody Seitz	ANC Public Meeting	<p>Goals and objectives 2, 3, 4 and 5                      Combine two and three. Have all land owners remove the snow from their sidewalks within 24 hours. MOA should hire additional plow trucks as needed to remove all snow within 24 hours of snowfall. Have MOA remove piled snow from neighborhoods.</p> <p>Provide shelters and benches at all bus stops.</p> <p>Slow down traffic on Boniface. Provide a L turn out of 38th to Tudor.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>
14 Jun 2017	Stephen Schell	ANC Public Meeting	<p>Coordinate with MOA land use plan, specifically transit-oriented and Greenway oriented development. Please consider actual numbers, not just percentage of users. IE 2% of Transit users is +/- 6000 people. Planning should considered maintenance budgets/replacement; full life cycle cost analysis. Moa should consider budget related to actual use. This plan should include a comprehensive and useful public involvement process for future projects. Not including the public until late in a project prevents useful input. Decrease designs speeds. Adopt complete streets! Projects: continue Coastal Trail S. to Potter Marsh, Use AKRR corridor for a multi-use trail.</p>
14 Jun 2017	Louise Fode	ANC Public Meeting	<p>I think we need to educate the public drivers on pedestrian and bicycle safety we also need to improve safety on the buses and make it seem more feasible for people to ride. I'd like to see more bus routes into outer neighborhoods I work in West Anchorage and cannot access my work by bus even though there are many homes around my job and people would ride the bus.</p> <p>Goal 1: Why do we want to preserve the existing system? It stinks. Better language would be maintain the system in good repair.</p> <p>Need: Divert train tracks from Crossing C Street, which is a major thoroughfare. This causes a big back up at rush hour when a freight train crosses the street.</p> <p>Need: I don't like the new bike lane on Raspberry road (heading E) because it crosses the entrance to Minnesota and drivers have to cross it. It seems unsafe and is intimidating. The tunnel under Minnesota is poorly lit, poorly maintained (trash, cracks in sidewalk) and is unsafe. I consider it the lesser of two evils.</p> <p>On Anchorage Road weather management system that integrates with the state DOT so that weather is prepared for and responded to appropriately.</p>
14 Jun 2017	Linda and Steve Tandy	ANC Public Meeting	<p>We need bus route 60 in order to go to work and other appointments. We will have to walk 1.5 to Dimond Center. The sidewalks will be covered with ice and snow for about 6 months of the year. Why should other routes get a bus every 15 minutes when ours will be taken away? This plan does not represent our section of town. What is a full bus? Bus #60 has between 15 - 21 every time I ride it.</p>
14 Jun 2017	Anonymous	ANC Public Meeting	<p>Need to move Beyond existing patterns of land use development: away from scroll to focused growth. Model land-use assumptions need to reflect MOA long range planning efforts re land use map ie Transit corridors, higher density with mixed-use and mixed incomes</p>

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>Need less emphasis on the automobile. Highway level of service being used is outdated and no longer appropriate for Anchorage metropolitan area. MTP model must integrate a multi-modal level of service approach (walk, bike, bus, rail). Person trips not vehicle trips.</p> <p>Need to seriously address the fact our society is experiencing a period of significant disruption in the transportation system. Uber, Lyft and other Auto sharing techniques. Automated Vehicles resulting in increase safety and higher more efficient use of existing Road capacity. Electric vehicles reducing revenues from motor fuel taxes. Societal demographics young and old wanting a less auto-centric lifestyle.</p> <p>Need to address the" Free Riders" from Mat-Su commuting to Anchorage without paying to support the infrastructure.</p> <p>Need to address the issue of mandatory free parking of vehicles- subsidy for auto-centric lifestyle</p>
14 Jun 2017	Cheryl Richardson	General Comment	<p><b>From:</b> Cheryl Richardson  <b>Sent:</b> Wednesday, June 14, 2017 10:50 AM  <b>To:</b> Underwood, Vivian R.  <b>Subject:</b> screening critieria and public comments</p> <p>Vivian, what is the status of the proposed project screening criteria please?</p> <p>And when will the comments received on the criteria be posted?</p> <p>Thank you,  Cheryl</p>
14 Jun 2017	James Vermillion	General Comment	<p>I am disappointed to see our transportation plan only expanding current infrastructure and methodologies. It lacks innovation and future vision. We should be developing secondary transportation methods within existing corridors. For example: An electric light rail link between downtown Anchorage, Eagle River and Wasilla. Take a look at the excellent example of this in the city of Basel, Switzerland. Service there runs every 6 minutes through downtown with branches to all of the bedroom communities surrounding the city. It runs in the Swiss Alps in the Winter. It is inexpensive and convenient. We could have the same or better with some forward thinking and planning.</p>
15 Jun 2017	Christine Opland	General Comment	<p>I have recently become very concerned with the Municipal transportation system. The most recent massive change in the Peplemover bus system happened before I found out about it. I learned of the discussion from a friend who doesn't even use the system. Insofar as my family is concerned we have been set back 40+ years. We no longer have reasonable access to the bus system as of this October.</p> <p>My priority is getting the bus system in the outer perimeter back up and running. I would like to see the municipality move toward a city area that is free of motorized traffic, and fewer private vehicles on the roads.</p> <p>As the parent of a special needs adult, I would also like to see more commuter bike trails that are separated from motor traffic.</p>

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
15 Jun 2017	Sarah Dutton	Eagle River Public Meeting	<p>Drivers from the Driftwood Bay Area (Eagle River) on busy mornings make U-turns at the Frontage road/Parkview Terrace entrance causing problems for driver trying to exit and merge. Can a U-turn option be added at the N. Montague Light and no U-turn sign be posted or at least a U-turns yield to merging traffic sign?</p> <p>At the light of Old Glenn Highway and ER Loop Road by Walgreens and Tesoro, can a line be painted for the left turn lane to stop a little further back on red as people turning left from the other lanes cut into/over the yellow line because the angle is sharper for two left turn Lanes in both directions?</p>
15 Jun 2017	Cheryl Richardson	General Comment	<p><b>From:</b> Cheryl Richardson [  <b>Sent:</b> Thursday, June 15, 2017 9:23 AM  <b>To:</b> Lyon, Craig H.  <b>Cc:</b> Underwood, Vivian R.; Hart, Hal H  <b>Subject:</b> Craig, a couple of questions, please</p> <p>Yesterday I asked staff for the status of the project screening criteria, and got 'we'll get back to you.'</p> <p>Then I noticed an extension of the 'formal comment period,' for both the MTP goals, objectives and performance standards <i>and</i> apparently the screening criteria.</p> <p>I am not clear what to tell people, or how ACC should respond to the reopened comment period.</p> <p>May I offer one way to keep confusion at bay?</p> <p>Take the list of emails gathered from folks who signed in for MTP updates, and produce email updates. I expect this would reduce the number of individual emails and phone calls coming in, and broaden public participation.</p> <p>Secondly, I have not seen the comments that were received, nor do I know of changes that were made to goals, objectives, performance standards or screening criteria in response to comments. Surely the public needs that information before submitting more comments? That information could be sent out by email, with links to the appropriate documents.</p> <p>In the meantime, can you please tell me where we are in this process? Are the initial screening criteria being applied now? If so, isn't it misleading to state that the formal comment period ends July 14?</p>
23 Jun 2017	Ben Sullender	General Comment	<p>"Focus on sensible bicycle routes!  The greenbelt system in Anchorage is first-rate for recreation and leisure, but is woefully ineffective for purposeful transportation. The Chester Creek / Coastal Trail / Campbell Creek system simply does not connect common destinations. When was the last time you went shopping in Kincaid Park? Or how many people work at Westchester? How about stopped at your favorite restaurant on the coastal mudflats? ...then why does our bike system focus on those</p>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>out-of-the-way destinations at the expense of places where we actually need to go on a regular basis? When we need to get to a store on Northern Lights or a restaurant in Midtown, we have no safe options available but to drive a car. Similarly, working downtown, I am forced to bike on poorly signed streets, with cars honking at me, passing in dangerously close quarters. I am not allowed on sidewalks, but these are the only safe option for travel around downtown. I'd rather take a few glares from pedestrians than be hit by aggressive drivers not used to seeing bikes.</p> <p>The solution would be to add in dedicated, painted bike lanes, preferably with dividers from the main road. Understand the patterns of where people travel (stores, groceries, restaurants, bars, concerts, gyms, etc.) and make sure that there are N/S and E/W bike lanes that run right through Midtown and Spenard, for example. "</p>
13 Jul 2017	Cynthia Wentworth	General Comment	<p><b>From:</b> Cynthia Wentworth  <b>Sent:</b> Thursday, July 13, 2017 11:02 AM  <b>To:</b> AMATS Info; Hart, Hal H  <b>Subject:</b> Comments on 2040 plan</p> <p>To Whom it May Concern:</p> <p>Due to my time constraints as a volunteer, I am hoping paid staff members will take the following information I have provided to the community and integrate it into the MTP 2040.</p> <p><b>Update: Can commuter rail reduce Alaska CO2 emissions?</b></p> <p>Alaska's Arctic and subarctic regions are warming at twice the global pace. Yet when it comes to transportation policies that would reduce CO2 emissions, Alaska lags.</p> <p>National averages show significant emission savings from rail transit. While the private auto averages .96 pounds of CO2 per passenger mile, and bus transit .64 pounds per passenger mile, commuter rail averages .33 pounds per passenger mile.</p> <p>In February 2017 the Alaska Department of Transportation submitted its final "State Rail Plan" to the Federal Railroad Administration without changes to the Draft recommended by the Alaska Railroad Corporation and the public. They did this despite the fact that the Rail Plan is ADOT's statutory responsibility under a 2008 federal law called the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act (PRIIA). To be eligible for the capital grant funding authorized under PRIIA, states must develop state rail plans that are accepted by the Federal Railroad Administration. (<b>sierra borealis</b> June 2016)</p> <p>The Alaska Railroad is a State owned corporation set up like a private business, under the Alaska Department of Commerce and Economic Development. Both the Commerce and Economic Development Commissioner and the Department of Transportation Commissioner sit on its Board of Directors. The Department of Transportation began its rail planning under PRIIA by forming a Rail Plan Policy Committee in 2013 consisting of these commissioners and the commissioner of the Alaska Department of Natural Resources, plus the heads of the Alaska Railroad Corporation and the White Pass and Yukon Railroad.</p> <p>The Department held public meetings in the Matanuska-Susitna Borough as it developed the State Rail Plan. These meetings saw strong public interest in commuter rail. In October 2013 a Policy Committee and a Technical Committee consisting of local government and transportation user</p>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>representatives composed a “vision and goals” statement which included commuter rail between the Matanuska Susitna Borough, Anchorage, and the Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport. Commuter rail would be relatively easy to implement because the rail track already connects these locations.</p> <p>Unfortunately, after 2013, active work on the Rail Plan slowed, then stopped. To the disappointment of the Alaska Railroad Corporation and citizen activists, the Draft Rail Plan finally released in December 2015 was not updated from 2013. However, it was a step in the right direction in that it praises rail as a means to reduce emissions and highway congestion. However, it considers rail unfeasible because of its costs.</p> <p>The Plan failed to address citizen comments on the need for multi modal transportation planning in the Glenn Highway corridor. This is ironic, because capital costs to begin commuter rail are small compared to what the Department is spending or planning to spend on Glenn Highway improvements. On its projects webpage, the Alaska Department of Transportation has listed “highway congestion and accidents” as reasons for adding lanes to the Glenn Highway. No mention is made of commuter rail.</p> <p>And south of Anchorage, the \$4.15 million spent each year on subsidizing the Whittier tunnel (which was supposed to pay its own way through tolls) exceeds the \$3.6 million annual subsidy required to operate commuter rail.</p> <p>Is it cost effective or environmentally smart to keep pouring money into Alaska’s highways, with their high carbon emissions per passenger mile, while planners say that commuter rail is “too expensive?”</p> <p>In May 2003, Anchorage’s Municipal Assembly passed a resolution supporting commuter rail between the Matsu Borough and three of Anchorage’s largest employment centers: downtown, the airport, and the Dimond Shopping Mall. The Alaska Railroad track already goes to the airport and passes Dimond Center on its way south. To the north, it parallels the Glenn Highway between Anchorage and the Matsu Borough. Both freight and passenger trains (currently geared to tourists) run daily along this track.</p> <p>The Matsu Valley City of Wasilla drew up plans in 2015 to move the historic Wasilla station in order to better accommodate trains and car traffic, provide bus and cab drop off, and more parking for commuters. A potential station near the Glenn/Parks interchange is being considered, as well as possible stations at Eklutna, Birchwood, Eagle River, and Elmendorf Air Force Bases. Since 2002, \$78 million has been spent straightening the track, making potential commuter rail time competitive with driving.</p> <p><b>Background on highways versus commuter rail in Alaska</b></p> <p>So why was the sprawl-inducing Glenn Highway interchange built (along with more additions to the Glenn Highway) and why is the “Smart Choice” commuter rail only “visionary” 15 years later?</p> <p>The first part of the answer is that the U.S. is a highway centric country. Although both highways and commuter rail anywhere in the world require capital expenditures and operating subsidies, in the U.S. it is much easier to get money for highways than it is for rail. Still, cities such as Seattle and Salt Lake City have shown that getting money for commuter rail is possible.</p> <p>Secondly, our Alaska Department of Transportation is still basically a highway and aviation agency. Our State Department of Transportation is so highway-centric that the Alaska State Rail Plan is not even mentioned in the State’s Long Range Transportation Policy Plan! The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), where money is programmed, mentions the Highway Safety Plan and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, but not the State Rail Plan. In both 2015 and 2016, interested activists commented on this STIP, but, we have received no response to our comments on the need for multi-modal Glenn Highway corridor planning in the STIP.</p>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>A true multi-modal transportation corridor plan would list all costs – those for cars, bus rapid transit, and rail. These include accidents, public safety, CO2 emissions, comfort, and amenities such as coffee and restrooms, and time efficiency (ability to use laptops and read books) – as well as the capital and operating costs of highway and rail infrastructure. Without actually quantifying all costs, some remain hidden. This perpetuates the myth that rail is more expensive than road.</p> <p>Anchorage residents, especially young people working in the retail and the technology sectors, regularly ask me: “Why don’t we have commuter rail? “I don’t like buses, but if they had commuter rail I’d move to the Valley!” Friends who live in the Valley recently said to me: “This winter there was a highway accident every other week, turning our one-hour commute into two hours. We need another option!”</p> <p>Every year the Alaska Railroad runs the “Green Line” to the Alaska State Fair in the Matsu community of Palmer, with help from its corporate sponsors. This train, which runs three times per day on Saturdays and Sundays, twice on Fridays and twice on Labor Day during the two Fair weekends, is so popular that it sells out weeks in advance. Besides all the positive numbers on ridership that have appeared in commuter rail feasibility studies conducted since 1979, the State Fair train is proof positive that people like riding trains.</p> <p><b>Anchorage area transit progress</b></p> <p>In the past year, the Municipality of Anchorage’s Planning Department has made progress on commuter rail. The Muni is now open to designating parts of the Alaska Railroad corridor as a transit oriented development corridor on its Land Use Plan Map, though this still needs approval by the Municipal Assembly. Assembly approval would be consistent with their 2003 resolution supporting commuter rail.</p> <p>Anchorage’s Climate Action Plan calls for Anchorage to become the most energy efficient city in America. The current Metropolitan Transportation Plan predicts the number of daily commuters on the Glenn Highway to increase from the present 25,000 to 40,000 by 2035. A new transportation plan is needed to make better use of an underutilized asset: the Alaska Railroad.</p> <p>Now more than ever, commuter rail needs to be a “smart choice”, as it was in 2002. However, for this to happen, Alaska’s Governor , Anchorage and Matsu Borough Mayors, and our state legislators need to hear more voices from citizens.</p> <p>--by Cynthia Wentworth, Alaska Chapter transportation chair</p>
13 Jul 2017	Cynthia Wentworth	General Comment	<p><b>From:</b> Cynthia Wentworth  <b>Sent:</b> Thursday, July 13, 2017 11:02 AM  <b>To:</b> AMATS Info; Hart, Hal H  <b>Subject:</b> Comments on 2040 plan</p> <p>To Whom it May Concern:</p> <p>Due to my time constraints as a volunteer, I am hoping paid staff members will take the following information I have provided to the community and integrate it into the MTP 2040.</p> <p>Municipality of Anchorage, Planning Department</p>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>Comments on Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map (LUPM) From: Cynthia Wentworth</p> <p>May 23, 2016</p> <p>As a native born Anchorage resident, a former employee of the Alaska Railroad Corporation, and a long time advocate for commuter rail, my comments focus on the need to designate four Alaska Railroad (ARR) corridors for Transit Oriented Development in Anchorage’s Land Use Plan. This would 1) address the needs of three of Anchorage’s largest employment centers, which already have rail connections (Downtown, Stevens Anchorage International Airport (AIA), and Dimond Center); 2) further the May 13, 2003 Municipal Assembly Resolution calling for commuter rail to connect Matsu with these three employment centers (attached); and 3) make the Land Use Plan consistent with the studies already completed and the millions of dollars spent towards implementation of commuter rail in the Anchorage bowl.</p> <p>The four ARR corridors needing rail transit designation are the following:</p> <p>1) Downtown Anchorage to Matsu Valley, Anchorage Bowl section</p> <p>Reference: <i>Alaska State Rail Plan Draft</i>, January 2016. Appendix C: <i>South-central Alaska Commuter Rail Concept of Operations</i>. ADOT&amp;PF website</p> <p>This concept of Operations cites several commuter rail feasibility studies, including the 1979 <i>Feasibility Analysis of Upgraded Passenger Rail in the Anchorage, Alaska Region</i> prepared for the Municipality of Anchorage and ADOT&amp;PF, the 1988 <i>Anchorage Commuter Rail</i> study sponsored by the Municipality of Anchorage, the Matsu-Borough, and the Alaska Railroad Corporation, the 2002 <i>South Central Rail Network Commuter Study and Operations Plan</i>, sponsored by the Alaska Railroad Corporation, and the 2009 ridership update to this study titled the <i>Wasilla-Anchorage Commuter Rail Concept of Operations</i>.</p> <p>2) Downtown Anchorage to Stevens International Airport</p> <p>Reference: <i>Market Analysis for ARRC Anchorage International Airport Rail Station</i>, Commuter Rail Section, Northern Economics, July 1999.</p> <p>3) ARR corridor, Downtown Anchorage and Stevens International Airport to Dimond Center</p> <p>Reference: <i>Dimond Center Intermodal Feasibility Study</i>, Kinney Engineering LLC for Muni Transportation Dept., August 2011.</p> <p>4) Dimond Center to Girdwood, Anchorage Bowl section</p> <p>References: <i>Market Analysis for ARRC Anchorage International Airport Rail Station</i>, Commuter Rail Section, Northern Economics, July 1999; <i>South Central Rail Network Commuter Study and Operations Plan</i>, 2002, sponsored by the Alaska Railroad Corporation</p>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>Information from the above references along with updated population estimates, needs to be incorporated into the LUPM planning process.</p> <p>The establishment of “Transit Oriented Villages” with a radius of ¼ to 1/3 mile around the downtown depot and Dimond Center, and within a mile of the Airport rail station, as well as in other strategic locations, would go a long way towards making commuter rail economically viable and in turn making Anchorage a more “green”, less auto dependent city. This would further Mayor Berkowitz’s Climate change Action Plan and his desire for Anchorage to be the most energy efficient city in America.</p> <p>I realize that the railroad right of way and adjacent areas belong to the railroad, and that much of the land is designated for industrial uses, thus not appropriate for residential development. However, a study needs to be made of land within walking distance of the rail corridor that would be suitable for residential development, and whether or not it would be possible to have rail stations in any of these areas.</p> <p>Rail stations already exist downtown and at the Airport. Commuter rail stations have been planned for downtown, the Airport, and Dimond Center. These three locations need to be part of or connected to Transit Supportive Development Corridors. Indeed, commuter rail has been one justification for both the Airport rail station and the Dimond Center receiving substantial amounts of federal money. The Airport rail station was built with \$28 million from the FRA because Anchorage was a non-attainment area for air quality and commuter rail was seen as part of the solution (see my attached Alaska Dispatch News article, June 2014, two Anchorage Daily News LTEs, Dec. 2002, and an excerpt from the Alaska Railroad’s 1998 Annual Report). The above- cited Market Analysis for the Airport Rail Station devotes 21 pages to commuter rail.</p> <p>The South Anchorage Intermodal Transportation Center (Dimond Center) received \$2.5 million from SAFETY-LU in 2005. In April 2008 the Alaska Railroad Corporation submitted the Dimond Center Intermodal Transportation Center Project Development Plan for a rail station at Dimond Center, for \$5 million. What is the status of these developments? Where is the follow through in this plan, given that commuter rail was a justification for these expenditures?</p> <p>The above cited Dimond Center Intermodal Feasibility Study (Kinney Engineering LLC, August 2011) together with its Appendix E, South Anchorage Intermodal Center Project Prospectus (May 2005) and its Appendix F – Dimond Center Transportation Center Project Development Plan (Alaska Railroad Corporation April 2008) need to be integrated into the LUPM. These plans are full of information about increased use of rail, such as using the Chugach Explorer DMU as a potential ski train with a minimal train passenger facility between Klatt Road and 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and having a triangular service between Ship Creek, the airport, and Dimond Center that would serve tourists and rural residents. The study mentions ARRC’s interest in providing rail service for commuters from the Matsu Valley to Girdwood. In addition, the study states that businesses want to bring cruise ship tourist traffic to Dimond Mall. Still another idea mentioned, is to transport Girdwood students attending South High School, by Alaska Railroad DMU with connecting bus service at either end.</p> <p>The Dimond Center Intermodal Feasibility study discusses determining rail transit ridership estimates and rail modal share. This or something similar, needs to be incorporated into or referred to in the LUPM document, so that rail modal shares is part of the basis for the Municipal Transportation Plan.</p>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>Specific comments:</p> <p>p. 23 – Regional Commercial Center.</p> <p>The Dimond Center area is designated a Regional Commercial Center on the map. If the planning for Dimond Center follows through here and has residential uses as recommended, then this area should be part of a Transit Supportive Development Corridor.</p> <p>p. 25 and map – Commercial Corridor: It states here that Commercial Corridors can have residential or mixed use projects up to 8 to 40 housing units per site acre. I see some Commercial Corridor lands along Dimond Boulevard, ¼ to ½ mile from Dimond Center. This needs to be highlighted in support of Dimond Center being a Transit Supportive Development Corridor.</p> <p>p. 30 – Railroad Facility</p> <p>This section needs to specify what has been accomplished to date: the downtown Depot, the Airport Rail Station and Dimond Center Intermodal Facility have already been built or partially built (with federal money) and were and are intended for commuter rail. I am referring to the following paragraph “This Land Use Designation also identifies potential passenger railway intermodal stations along the Alaska Railroad right of way” ....(I don’t see a track going to the airport)..... “These features could interact with transit oriented development in designated Centers and connect to local public transit service. Some commuter stations already exist or are in planning stages” (Where?) “Others are envisioned later in the planning horizon” (Where?).</p> <p>p. 34 – Growth Supporting Features: Transit Supportive Development 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph: “There must be a critical mass of people living, shopping and working in the area, who are potential transit users.”</p> <p>Designating the four Transit Supportive Development Corridors along the ARR Corridor, along with the establishment of “Transit Oriented Villages” around rail stations, will help attain this critical mass sooner. This in turn would help make commuter rail economically viable, and help fulfill the quality of life goals in Anchorage’s Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>Other comments: People I talk to, the latest example being two ATT employees who work at Dimond Center, would much rather ride a train than a bus between the Matsu Valley and Anchorage. One told me that he and his fiancé would move to the Valley if commuter rail became available. As for express bus service between the Valley and Anchorage, he would not ride it. He’d rather drive his car because he feels a bus lacks privacy and is not as comfortable as a train. The Alaska Railroad’s “Green Line” to the State Fair is sold out every year. I doubt if an express bus would be as popular.</p> <p>On April 27, 2016 I was surprised to read in Anchorage’s PRESS (Zack Fields, April 14-20 2016) that according to municipality’s planning director Hal Hart, Anchorage does not have sufficient density for commuter rail. As well as going against the 2003 municipal resolution, this certainly is not the conclusion in any of the feasibility studies referenced above, which have confirmed a strong interest in commuter rail. Thousands of people are commuting daily by car</p>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>from the Matsu Valley to work downtown, at Stevens AIA, and at Dimond Center. Because the Matsu Borough is the fastest growing area in Alaska, this number will keep increasing. Even if some people believe that Anchorage does not presently have the density for commuter rail, these rail corridors need to be designated Transit Oriented Development Corridors now in order to affect how the surrounding land develops. This will preserve the rail transit option for the future, as Anchorage grows and becomes more dense. Also, there needs to be public accountability for the \$80 million spent on improving the ARR track between Anchorage and Wasilla, the \$28 million spent on the airport rail station, and the \$ 7.5 million spent on the Dimond Center Intermodal Plan, all with commuter rail as a justification.</p> <p>While serving on Anchorage’s Municipal Transit Advisory Board (1984-1991) I visited and rode on Portland’s new Tri Met and Sacramento’s new light rail (1986). I heard a lot about the opposition to these projects, on the grounds that there was not enough density. Yet in Portland at least, it was the opening of Tri Met that has caused the city to become much more dense and transit oriented.</p>
14 Jul 2017	Cheryl Richardson	General Comment	<p><b>From:</b> Cheryl Richardson  <b>Sent:</b> Friday, July 14, 2017 7:42 PM  <b>To:</b> AMATS Info  <b>Cc:</b> Hart, Hal H  <b>Subject:</b> Comments on Anchorage's Metropolitan Transportation Plan</p> <p>What steps can Anchorage take so that our transportation dollars and systems help build our city, rather than work against so many of our community values including public health and safety, cost effective mobility, commercial viability, transportation choices and environmental protection</p> <p>Anchorage's bus system and our forthcoming Land Use Plan newly focus on building a great winter city. It's time for AMATS to step up to the plate and contribute.</p> <p>AMATS newest goals were announced in May (and actually approved in early June) even though AMATS pushed their public comment deadline to July 14. Those goals are traditional and road based, and for two months, AMATS has provided no information on comments received, no public discussion of the issues, nor have they produced an issue response summary. Instead, AMATS has conducted business as usual, based on their June approval of these outmoded goals.</p> <p>The past two months have not generated an open or productive public process that will lead to community consensus regarding our public investments. Instead we are seeing an opaque, top down, 'the experts are in charge' decision-making.</p> <p>In contrast, San Francisco has set transportation goals that can show how to use transportation resources to achieve overarching community goals:</p> <p>Bay Area (SFO) Transportation Goals - Targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Climate Protection</li> <li>• Adequate Housing</li> <li>• Healthy and Safe Communities</li> <li>• Open Space and Agricultural Protection</li> <li>• Equitable Access</li> <li>• Economic Vitality</li> <li>• Transportation System Effectiveness</li> </ul>

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>Compare that with Anchorage's transportation goals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preserve the Existing System</li> <li>2. Improve Safety</li> <li>3. Improve Travel Conditions</li> <li>4. Support the Economy</li> <li>5. Environmental Sustainability</li> <li>6. Quality Decision-Making: Make sound public investments.</li> </ol> <p>Anchorage appears stuck in the past, and potentially wasting its transportation dollars building roads and transportation systems that are not likely to help us build the city we say we want.</p> <p>Please refer to Anchorage Citizens Coalition's June 7 comments that illustrate the kinds of goals and objectives we need to see in order to build the winter city described in Anchorage 2020 and provide relief to beleaguered neighborhoods and commercial districts.</p>
14 Jul 2017	Bart Rudolph	<a href="#">Tech Memo 1A</a>  <a href="#">Initial Screening Criteria</a>	<p><b>From:</b> Rudolph, Bart H  <b>Sent:</b> Friday, July 14, 2017 11:16 PM  <b>To:</b> Underwood, Vivian R. ; Aaron Jongenelen ; AMATS Info  <b>Cc:</b> Hodges, Collin P; Hassan, Abul  <b>Subject:</b> AMATS Tech Memo 1A and 1B Comments</p> <p>Please see below my comments regarding Tech Memo 1A and 1B.</p> <p>Tech Memo 1A:  There should be a goal more focused on equitable access.</p> <p>Tech Memo 1B:  When tables are spread over multiple pages, it would be helpful to have "continued" in the title of the subsequent pages. Example, "Table 2-1 Continued. Draft 2040 MTP Initial Screen Criteria"</p> <p>Table 2-5 - Add criteria for system reliability.</p> <p>Table 2-5 - Add criteria for Transit Supportive Development areas. Projects in those areas should be given priority.  The project prioritization criteria (tables 2-4 through 2-6) should include a land use connection component. For example, does the proposed project support the goals of the land use plan and sounding land use?</p>

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Comments Received: March 28-July 14, 2017

Date Received	Name	Document	Comment
			<p>It is unclear how the alternatives evaluation will take into consideration all the different modes. How will projects across different modes with competing interests be scored and ranked? For example, it is clear that the model will be used to help identify congestion relief projects, but there are areas of town where bike/ped/transit projects should be prioritized over congestion projects. How will AMATS build consensus on those areas and what criteria will be used to identify those projects? There seems to be a section or process missing between the "Model Run Evaluation" and "Project Prioritization" as identified in Figure 2-1. A more detailed section should be added to this memo describing the multi-modal alternatives evaluation process.</p> <p>Bart Rudolph                      Planning and Communications Manager                      MOA Public Transportation Department</p>