

Subject: Agency Committee Meeting #5
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025
Location: Microsoft Teams

Agency and Tribal Committee Member Organizations Invited to Attend:

US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Regulatory	MOA, Historic Preservation
Alaska Department of Natural Resources (DNR), State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)	Native Village of Eklutna
Municipality of Anchorage (MOA), Watershed Management (Wetlands, Floodplains)	Knik Tribal Council
MOA, Parks and Recreation	Don Young Port of Alaska
	Merrill Field
	Alaska Railroad Corporation
	Eklutna, Inc.
	Knikatu, Inc.
	Anchorage Museum

Meeting Attendees:

Amy Burnett, HDR	Fred Land, USACE
Galen Jones, DOT	Richard Martin, Knik Tribe-Preservation Office
John McPherson, HDR	Bob Charles, Knik Tribe-Roads Director
Paige Barker, HDR	Doug Kolwaite, DOT&PF
Olivia Ortiz, USACE	

Agenda:

- **Introductions**
- **Screening Highlights**
- **Recommendations**
- **Next Steps**
- **Discussion**
 - **Q&A**
 - **Share your feedback!**

Presentation (Screening Highlights, Recommendations, Next Steps)

Galen Jones and John McPherson led the meeting with a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following topics.

- Alternatives
- Recommended Alternative
- Phasing Implementation
- Recommended Transit Route
- Recommended Port Connection
- Fairview Bypass-Livability
- Greenway/Complete Streets

The presentation summarized the screening highlights for the alternatives that moved forward from the last public comment and evaluation period. Alternatives include:

- Alternative 1: No Action – Required/baseline against which all other alternatives are measured:
 - Does not meet the purpose and need
- Alternative 2: MTP – The 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which is the most likely outcome if no action is taken as a result of the PEL Study:
 - Does not meet the purpose and need on its own (marginal on traffic and safety)
 - Continues to route Interstate Highway System (IHS) traffic through Fairview
 - Causes traffic diversion impacts
 - Has no Main Street
 - Adopted projects are incorporated into Alternatives 3, 4, and 5
- Alternative 3: Transit Focus – Does not include a new regional parkway, but does reconfigure Gambell Street as a two-lane, two-way main street, and Ingra Street as a two-lane, two way street with a center turn lane. This is in keeping with the goals of the Fairview neighborhood. This alternative also recommends a variety of Transit improvements. Alternative 3:
 - Does not meet the purpose and need on its own (marginal on traffic and safety)
 - Continues to route IHS traffic through Fairview
 - Causes traffic diversion impacts
 - Offers low ridership benefits for high operation and maintenance costs
 - The Downtown-Fairview-Midtown-U-Med route is recommended.

- **Alternative 4: Ingra Tunnel:**
 - Has high tunnel costs (construction/operations and maintenance)
 - Involves tunneling construction risk and complexity
 - Is less attractive to traffic than Alternative 5 at a higher cost
 - Does not accommodate hazardous materials
- **Alternative 5: Fairview Bypass –** This is the recommended alternative. The team reviewed the following regarding this alternative:
 - Benefit highlights include it being best for safety, bikes and pedestrians, green space, traffic reduction through Fairview, lowest traffic diversion, and highest usage.
 - Challenge highlights include highest right of way and relocations, noise concerns, airport concerns, construction on former landfill.
 - The Implementation Plan showcases 11 resulting projects in the order they might be developed in and the cost for each.
 - Features include a depressed parkway along 15th Avenue with motorized, pedestrian, and green spaces maintaining connections between north and south Fairview; a Gambell Street “main street,” and a Hyder Street pedestrian boulevard that results in loop bike/pedestrian trail around northwest Anchorage.

After completing the overview of the recommended alternative, the team shared “next steps” for the PEL Study and development of any recommendations that may result.

The presentation concluded with a Q&A and discussion as follows.

Questions/Discussion

Bob Charles: Commended the new recommended alternative. “It resolves a lot of issues that were previously raised. Thank you for presenting it this way.

Richard Martin: I think this is the best plan; now let’s see if we can get money for it.

Fred Land: We appreciate the efforts you have made to avoid green spaces.

Galen: I’m curious if anyone’s organization plans to submit comments on this.

- Bob: Yes, I will submit it through the website.
- Galen: Your support is very helpful.

Amy Burnett: Advised the group on different resources for providing comments.

Richard: Regarding port connection – trucks will most likely still take Minnesota, right?

- John: Yes, that route will still be useful to trucks.

Richard: Most of the property issues will be on that route to the port, right?

- John: There will be some ROW there; most of the relocations will be on the curve from 15th to the highway. It would be great if we could make the connection without any impacts, but it's probably not possible.

Bob: I was wondering if the permitting side of the project could go through that “fast 41 process.”

- John: I’m not sure and I’m not sure it would be needed. That process is for federal/agency coordination to be smoother. There aren’t a lot of federal permits that would be needed, so I’m not sure if this process would be needed.

With no other questions, Galen thanked the committee for their time, directed them to resources, and concluded the meeting.